DE ECCLESIA ET CATHEDRA.

A SPECULUM *of the* EXTERNAL POLITY *of the* EMPIRE-CHURCH *of the* NICENE AGE, *illustrative of the Arguments in* Bk. iv. c. ii. § 3 (*taken principally from Bingham's Antiq. of the Christian Church*, Bk. ix. c. i. § 6).

†

CATHEDRA PETRI.

"The Bishop of the Catholic Church."
"The Pontifex Maximus."
"The Bishop of Bishops."
"The Shepherd of the Flock."

ROMA.

II. The Diœcese * of Alexandria.

Patriarch of Alexandria.

Provinciæ.	*Metropoles.*
Libya Superior	Ptolemais.
Libya Inferior	Dranicon.
Thebais	Antinopolis, or Lycopolis.
Ægyptus	Alexandria.
Arcadia	Oxyrinchus.
Augustanica	Pelusium.

The Diœcese of Italy.

Exarch † of Milan.

Flaminia & Picenum	

I. Suburbicariæ Ecclesiæ.

(The Ancient Roman Province.)

Patriarch of Rome.

Provinciæ.	*Metropoles.*
Picenum Suburbicarium	Roma.
Campania	Roma or Capua.
Tucina & Umbria	Roma.
Apulia & Calabria	Roma.
Brutia & Lucania	Roma.
Samnium	Roma.
Valeria	Roma.
Sicilia	Syracuse.
Sardinia	Calaris.
Corsica	—

The Diœcese of Illyricum

(Occidentale).

Exarch of Sirmium.

Pannonia Prima	Laureacum.
Pannonia Secunda	Sirmium.

III. The Diœcese of the East.

Patriarch of Antioch.

Provinciæ.	*Metropoles.*
Palæstina Prima	Cæsarea.
Phœnice	Tyrus.
Syria	Antiochia.
Cilicia Prima	Tarsus.
Cyprus	Constantia.
Arabia	Bostra.
Isauria	Seleucia.
Palæstina Salutaris	Jerusalem, or Ælia.
Palæstina Secunda	Scythopolis.
Phœnice Libani	Emissa.
Euphratensis	Hierapolis.
Syria Salutaris	Apamea.
Osrhœne	Edessa.
Mesopotamia	Amida.
Cilicia Secunda	Anazarbus.

Venetia & Histria	Aquileia.
Æmilia	Ravenna.
Liguria	Mediolanum.
Alpes Cottiæ	Mediolanum.
Rhætia Prima	Mediolanum.
Rhætia Secunda	—

The Diœcese of Africa.

EXARCH OF CARTHAGE.

Africa Proconsularis	Carthago.
Byzacium	The See of the Senior Bishop.
Numidia	—
Tripolis	Tripolis.
Mauritania Sitifensis	Sitifi.
Mauritania Cæsariensis,	Cæsarea.

The Diœcese of Gaul.

EXARCH OF ——

Viennensis	—
Lugdunensis Prima	Lugdunum.
Germania Prima	Treveris.
*Germania Secunda	Treveris.
Belgica Prima	Treveris.
Belgica Secunda	Rhemi.
Alpes Maritimæ	Ebrodunum.
Alpes Penninæ et Graiæ	Vienna.
Maxima Sequanorum	Vesontio.
Aquitania Prima	Bituriges.
Aquitania Secunda	Burdigala.
Novem Populorum	—
Narbonensis Prima	Narbo.
Norbonensis Secunda	Aquæ Sextiæ.
Lugdunensis Secunda	Rothomagus.
Lugdunensis Tertia	Turones.
Lugdunensis Senoniæ,	Senonia.
Dalmatia	Salona.
Noricum Mediterraneum	—
Noricum Ripense	—

The Diœcese of Spain.

EXARCH OF ——

Bætica	Hispalis.
Lusitania	Emerita Augusta.
Gallicia	Bracara.
Terraconensis	Tarraco.
Carthaginensis	Carthago Hispanica.
Tingitana	See of the Senior Bishop.
Insulæ Baleares	—

The Diœcese of Britain.

EXARCH OF ——

Maxima Cæsariensis	Eboracum.
Flavia Cæsariensis	Eboracum.
Britannia Prima	Londinum.
Britannia Secunda	Caerleon.
Valentia	Eboracum.

The Diœcese of Macedonia.

EXARCH OF THESSALONICA.

Achaia	Corinthus.
Macedonia	Thessalonica.
Creta	Gontyna.
Thessalia	Larissa.
Epirus Vetus	Nicopolis.
Epirus Nova	Dyrrachium.

The Diœcese of Dacia.

EXARCH OF ——

Dacia Mediterranea	Sardica.
Dacia Ripensis	Sardica.
Mœsia Prima	Sardica.
Dardania	Scupi.
Prævalitana	Acrida.

The Diœcese of Asia.

EXARCH OF EPHESUS.

Pamphylia	—
Hellespontus	Cyzicus.
Lydia	Sardes.
Pisidia	Antiochia.
Lycaonia	Iconium.
Phrygia Pacatiana	Laodicea.
Phrygia Salutaris	Synada.
Lycia	Myra.
Caria	—
Insulæ Cyclades	Rhodus.
Asia Proconsularis	Ephesus.

The Diœcese of Pontus.

EXARCH OF CÆSAREA.

Galatia	Ancyra.
Bithynia	Nicomedia.
Cappadocia Prima	Cæsarea.
Cappadocia Secunda	Tyana.
Honorias	Claudiopolis.
Paphlagonia	Gangra.
Pontus Polemoniacus	Neocæsarea.
Helenopontus	Amasea.
Armenia Prima	Sebastia.
Armenia Secunda	Melitine.
Galatia Salutaris	Pessinus, *al.* Justianopolis.

The Diœcese of Thrace.

EXARCH OF HERACLEA.

(Constantinople.)

Europa	Haraclea.
Thracia	Philippopolis.
Hæmi Montis	Adrinopolis.
Rhodope	Trajanopolis.
Mœsia Secunda	Marcianopolis.
Scythia	Tomi (without suffragans).

* The Latin orthography is given to distinguish the ancient from the modern diocese: the ancient ecclesiastical divisions were called (1) Diœceses, (2) Metropoles, and (3) Parochiæ—now known as dioceses.

† The Exarchs in the West were usually styled Primates.

DE ECCLESIA ET CATHEDRA:

OR

THE EMPIRE-CHURCH OF JESUS CHRIST.

An Epistle

BY THE HON. COLIN LINDSAY.

LIBRARY

VOLUME I.

ST. THOMAS' PRIORY
LIBRARY
ROSS, CALIFORNIA

LONDON
LONGMAN, GREEN, AND CO.
1857.

WYMAN AND SONS, PRINTERS,
GREAT QUEEN STREET, LINCOLN'S INN FIELDS,
LONDON, W.C.

CONTENTS

OF THE FIRST VOLUME.

PREFACE..... *Page* ix

BOOK I.

ANGLICAN CRITICISMS.

CHAPTER I.

INTRODUCTORY 1

CHAPTER II.

MY REVIEWERS 4

1. Case of S. Cyprian and Fermilian 8
2. Case of Apiarius 14
3. Case of S. Meletius and Paulinus at Antioch 16

CHAPTER III.

"REPRESENTATIVE MEN"..... 25

1. Pope S. Leo and the Œcumenical Councils ..... *ib.*
2. S. Chrysostom 62
3. S. Basil 95
4. S. Gregory of Nazianzum..... 110
5. S. Jerome 114
6. S. Augustine..... 123

CHAPTER IV.

RECAPITULATION 161

2572

BOOK II.

The Mystery of Iniquity.

CHAPTER I.

Introductory ..... *Page* 181

CHAPTER II.

The Pre-adamite Ages 186
1. The Fall of Satan 200

CHAPTER III.

The Creation of Man 204

CHAPTER IV.

The Fall 210

CHAPTER V.

The Mission of Jesus Christ 218

CHAPTER VI.

The War against Christ 222
1. The Ante-diluvian and Noachian Period..... 225
2. Post-diluvian Age..... 226
3. The Israelites 228
4. The Catholic Church—The Ten Persecutions..... 232

CHAPTER VII.

Satan restrained 243

BOOK III.

The Preparation.

CHAPTER I.

The Divine Plan 269

CHAPTER II.

THE PREPARATION..... *Page* 274
1. Moral Discipline ..... *ib.*
2. Art and Science 280
3. Political Economy 292
4. Rome..... 299
5. The Asiatic Powers 306

CHAPTER III.

THE LAW 310

BOOK IV.

THE EMPIRE-CHURCH.

CHAPTER I.

INTRODUCTORY 325

CHAPTER II.

UNIVERSALITY 334
1. Israel..... 335
2. Prophecy 348
3. The Babylo-Roman Empire..... 366
4. Prophecies fulfilled 385
5. The Testimony of the Holy Fathers 390

CHAPTER III.

THE CHURCH A VISIBLE POLITY 410
1. Doctrine of the Fathers 425

CHAPTER IV.

RECAPITULATION 438

BOOK V.

The Characteristic Mark of the Church.

CHAPTER I.

Introductory..... *Page* 443

CHAPTER II.

Oneness 448
1. Doctrine of the Fathers 451

CHAPTER III.

Indivisibility and Indefectibility 466
1. Doctrine of the Fathers 476
1. Indivisibility of the Church..... *ib.*
2. The Church One and Indefectible 498

CHAPTER IV.

Infallibility 528

CHAPTER V.

Recapitulation..... 560

PREFACE.

In presenting these volumes for publication I desire to state, at the outset, that my object was not to write a mere controversial work on the subject of the Papal Supremacy, but to endeavour to trace, as far as I could, the general scheme adopted by Almighty God for effecting the ultimate regeneration of the world and man its denizen: and likewise to give a view of those elementary laws, which God, from the very beginning, had constituted for the government and administration of His Kingdom upon earth. By pursuing this course it is hoped that a key will be placed in the hands of the pious reader which will enable him, with God's grace (for without the illuminative influence of the Holy Ghost, we can learn nothing of the ways of God), to ascertain for himself the great truths that have been revealed concerning the Kingdom of God on earth; and also to identify that one road through the wilderness of this world, which alone leads to the gate of the heavenly Jerusalem.

The following is a synopsis of the great subject I have ventured to discuss, which I give for the advantage of the reader.

I. The First Book is, indeed, entirely controversial, for it consists of a refutation of some of the principal arguments advanced by those gentlemen who did me the honour to review or notice my former work—"The Evidence for the Papacy"; and here, in passing, I desire to apologize to those Reviewers for the unavoidable length of time it has taken me to prepare and publish this present work, partly on account of absence from home and of other circumstances over which I had no control, and partly because of the very nature of my theme, which required of necessity much thought and research.

II. There was a time when perfect harmony reigned supreme throughout the universe, when all the Angelic Hosts adored with one accord the great Triune God of the heavens: but a rebellion broke out, headed by Satan, and evil was thus introduced into heavenly places. Whether those myriads of stars we see in the heavens above are the "habitations" of Angels we know not, but one thing seems certain, that there was an intimate connection between Satan and this planet; and this would appear from the circumstance that Christ described him as "the Prince of this world," and from His not disputing the claim of Satan to possession of "all the kingdoms of this world and the glory of them." Certain it is that, before the present formation, this earth "was without form and void," and enveloped in "darkness": and science indicates that it had been destroyed by a deluge of fire. Now taking into consideration what led to the destruction of the world by water in the time of Noah,

and what will certainly bring about the final judgment of God at the last day, it is reasonable to conclude that the condition of things called Chaos was on account of some great crime committed by intelligent creatures who had some connection (what we know not) with this planet.

After the fall of Satan man was created in the Image of God, a privilege which seems peculiar to him and his descendants, for it is nowhere stated that the Angels were made in the similitude of God. It is not improbable that one reason for this apparently exclusive privilege was, that Christ intended to become incarnate at the time ordained, that He might become visible to all intelligent creatures. I do not say that this is so, all I mean is, it is probable that man was made in the likeness of God, in order that, to use the words of the Psalmist, a Body might be prepared for Him.

Assuming that there really had been a connection of some sort between Satan and this earth, his envy of man's greatness is abundantly accounted for, and also his determination to enter upon a war with God to effect his ruin, and to recover possession of this world.

The newly-created pair were assaulted by him, and in the hour of trial they fell. From that moment "the Mystery of Iniquity," so far as our race was concerned, commenced, and it has been developing ever since, and will continue to develop till Christ shall come to judge the world, and destroy it, together with Satan and all the evil powers, and wicked men, his willing allies and dupes. This comprises my Second Book.

III. The Third Book contains an account of the general plan of Almighty God for preparing the human race for the reception of those sublime truths which, at the proper time, Jesus Christ would proclaim to the world by His Apostles and Evangelists. The mode of preparation adopted, as gathered from the general history of the ancient world, is thus summarized: (1) By the cultivation of the Arts and Sciences, by which the human mind underwent a long refining process, enabling it to conceive great and exalted ideas. (2) By the study of deep Philosophy, great minds striving to penetrate into the mysteries of nature and of nature's God, for which Philosophy, together with their general literature, the ancient Greeks were so justly renowned. (3) By the promulgation and enforcement of severe Codes of Law in the great leading countries of antiquity, which taught man the duty of self-restraint and self-sacrifice. (4) By the raising up of powerful Military Empires, which subjected men to a course of wholesome discipline, the result of which was to infuse into their minds the great virtues of obedience to authority, and of an elevated patriotism. And, lastly, by the establishment upon earth of the Kingdom of God, by which holy truths were gradually revealed under prophetic signs and symbols, the Law being imposed as a schoolmaster to bring men to Christ, and to render them, at the proper time, capable of bearing the Light of the fulness of divine truth. Not that I mean that man, in his natural state, however civilized he may be, can receive unaided the great truths of the Gospel; but unquestionably the long process of preparation

prescribed by the Divine Physician had the effect of elevating the human mind, to a certain extent above sense, and to enable it to appreciate Gospel truths, and by grace to accept the same in their full extent. Nothing shows this more than the readiness of the West (the fundamental principles of its laws being self-restraint and self-sacrifice) to receive truth, while in the East (its laws encouraging the indulgence of the passions) it made but little permanent progress.

IV. In the Fourth Book an account is given of the institution of the Holy Catholic Church, as an Empire, the dominion of which was destined to be conterminous with the confines of this earth. This great Empire is shown to be the outcome of the Kingdom of God under the former dispensations, notably of the Mosaic; its general history, its Tabernacle and Temple, inclusive of the furniture therein, and its law, being types and shadows of what was to be in the future Empire and Church. The twelve-fold form of the constitution was derived from one similar to that which prevailed in the Polity of Israel: and superadded to it the general political arrangements of the Roman Empire; for as the Empire of Christ was to be co-extensive with the area of this earth, a Polity suitable for this end was needed: hence the constitution of the Roman Empire furnished its framework and external Polity.

V. The Fifth Book enters upon a very important subject,—viz., "the Characteristic Mark of the Church"; and this is expressed by one word, "Unity"; that is, unity in matters of faith and

essential discipline; and unity in the form of government. This unity is divisible into four parts as essential elements constituting a perfect unity; viz., "Oneness," "Indivisibility," "Indefectibility," and "Infallibility." If any one of these fail, then real unity does not and cannot exist.

VI. After discussing these four points, I proceed to consider in Book Six. the organic law by which unity will be at all times maintained in its integrity; which law of unity is expressed under the symbol of the Cathedra or Chair, a word which Christ Himself employed, as indicating the plenary and infallible authority of the Cathedra, or Chair of Moses, under the law. To establish the Supreme Authority of the Cathedra Petri, or Chair of Peter, certain principles had to be ascertained which had been common to all the dispensations preceding the birth of Jesus Christ; and which, being cardinal, and therefore immutable, must of necessity find their places in the Christian commonwealth. These principles are called—(1) the Original, that is, the person in whom the dispensation takes its beginning: (2) the Monarchy, that is, that form of government which is vested in one person, and who at the same time is the Supreme Ruler during his lifetime and the Vicar of God. (3) The infallible Teacher and Judge in all matters relating to the doctrine of faith and morals, offices which are inseparably united to the Monarchy. (4) Again: as all men must, without any exception, pay the debt of nature, so, in order to preserve the perpetuity of the Empire-Church, a further principle was established by God from

the beginning, viz., that of a Succession to offices, and notably to that of the Monarchy; that is, in each dispensation, inclusive of the present one, Patriarchs succeed Patriarchs, Highpriests Highpriests, and Popes Popes, each of whom was in his time the Head of the world, and the Vicar of God. And, lastly, the principle of the Temporal Power, consisting of a certain territory set apart as God's own peculiar territorial kingdom, in which He reigns by His Vicar, and from which the law is ever going forth for the instruction of the people. These five principles, I show, are common to all the dispensations that have preceded that which now is; and being principles they are unchangeable, and must therefore form elementary laws in the Empire-Church which Jesus Christ established upon this earth before His final departure to the Right Hand of God.

VII. These principles are each proved from the Sacred Scriptures, but in the Seventh Book a complete testimony from the Fathers, Councils, and Popes is given, showing how in every variety of language and style the truths of these cardinal principles are, either explicitly or implicitly, recognized as essential laws in the constitution of the Empire-Church of Christ.

VIII. The Eighth Book consists of an examination of the terms of the Christian Covenant to which every baptized person is bound to adhere, at the risk of forfeiting his eternal salvation; for we have no rights of our own except what God by free gift has bestowed upon us; and if any one knowingly or deliberately rejects any one point of faith, no matter

what it may be, the Christian Covenant, so far as he is concerned, is null and void.

In conclusion, I have only to add that I trust that no error in point of doctrine or discipline will be found in this work; if so, I humbly, as in duty bound, submit myself to the proper authority for correction. I think, however, I may say with some confidence, that no such error will be detected, as I have had the valuable assistance of a friend—an eminent theologian—who kindly examined my proof-sheets, correcting what was erroneous, to whom I here express my cordial thanks. I am under deep obligations to Charles Seager, Esq., M.A., Professor of Oriental languages, who materially assisted me (for I know nothing of those languages) in explaining the original words our Lord probably used, when He said, as we have it in its present form, "Thou art Peter," &c., for the Greek was not the mother tongue of Jesus Christ, but one of the Syro-Chaldaic dialects of the Aramæan family of Oriental languages.

The English version of the Holy Scriptures, which I have chiefly used in this work, is that which is commonly known as "The Authorized Version," published originally under the authority of King James I. I have used it because it is more familiar to the majority of those who, I trust, will peruse the pages of these volumes. As regards the extracts from the writings of the Holy Fathers and Popes, the acts and decrees of plenary and œcumenical Councils, I have adopted as my text-books, the works chiefly of the late Very Rev.

Provost Waterworth, entitled the "Faith of Catholics,"* and "A Commentary by Writers of the First Five Centuries, on the Place of S. Peter in the New Testament; and that of S. Peter's Successors in the Church."† These volumes contain copious extracts from the patristic writings, giving every variety of orthodox teaching concerning the subject treated upon, inclusive of what may seem to some to witness against what are called "Ultramontane views." I need hardly say that I have compared the translation with the originals (choosing by preference, when possible, the Benedictine editions), and whenever any error has been detected in the translation it has been amended.

C. L.

Deer Park, Honiton, 1877.

* Three vols., published by Charles Dolman. London. 1846.

† One vol., published by Thomas Richardson & Son. London. 1871.

DE ECCLESIA ET CATHEDRA.

BOOK I.

ANGLICAN CRITICISMS.

CHAPTER I.

INTRODUCTORY.

The question has been asked whether it was my intention to reply to the criticisms that have appeared in some Anglican periodicals on my late work, entitled "The Evidence for the Papacy."* To this I might reply, *Cui bono?* We may argue and counter-argue *ad infinitum*, and yet get no nearer than we were before, and this for want of a judge or arbitrator, in whom both parties would have confidence, to decide authoritatively between us. This, however, would not satisfy the Anglican or Protestant mind, because they acknowledge no other authority than the Bible, or, the Bible and primitive Tradition, as interpreted by each indi-

* "The Evidence for the Papacy as derived from the Holy Scriptures and from Primitive Antiquity." Longmans, Green, & Co. London, 1870.

19

vidual or party. To reargue the question already considered would be but waste of time, and would lead to no good. I shall, however, touch upon one or two points, which seem to me important to notice; beyond that I do not propose to follow the arguments of the Reviewers of my work. This would be useless, for, as it will appear, they do not touch the main evidence for the Papacy, but certain small details, of no more account than similar points of criticism frequently brought by neologians and sceptics against some of the cardinal doctrines of our holy religion. I purpose in this work to do something better than merely to criticise my Criticisers. I propose to consider the following points of transcendent interest: viz. the reason and object God had in view for establishing upon earth a great universal Empire-Church, with the preparation He ordained for its reception by the world: and I further propose to show, from certain immutable principles laid down by God Himself in the beginning, what must necessarily have been the essential features of the constitution of this Empire-Church, and the law of unity by which it is in every age preserved from disintegration and consequent ruin. In the treatment of these great subjects I hope to demonstrate the untenableness of the Anglican position in the sight of God, and the absurdity, as well as the impossibility, of any other Church of Jesus Christ existing on earth, than that which He erected and instituted in the person of S. Peter and the Apostles, and built up upon their successors,—the Pope and Bishops, in union with him, for the time being of the Catholic Church. This epistle I address to

you, my dear friend, knowing as I do your love of truth for its own sake, and your desire to embrace it, as soon as you shall apprehend the same as being of God; and earnestly do I pray that in God's own time you may be enlightened with a ray of divine light, and that you may be led to sacrifice on the altar of faith irrational reason, which is nothing more than reason perverted by prejudice and false tradition, which hinders the action of the illuminating grace of divine knowledge in our hearts and minds. Christ is "the Way, the Truth, and the Life," * so we read in God's Word; therefore must we study Him under those three aspects, informing ourselves, by the use of our natural faculties, with the aid of prayer and a good will, of that "Way," that one royal way He has laid down for us to travel; of that "Truth" which He revealed, and which the Holy Ghost teaches even now in the Catholic Church; and of that "Life," without participation in which we cannot be saved, and which we cannot possess unless we be in "the Way" and in "the Truth."

* S. John xiv. 6.

CHAPTER II.

MY REVIEWERS.

When I had perused the Anglican reviews and notices of my late work, I could not help musing on the following points: what were the feelings and thoughts which chiefly occupied the hearts and minds of most of my Criticisers when they were writing their several notices? Did it not seem evident that most of them felt, and keenly too, the force of that evidence for the Papacy which they affected to ignore, and the hopeless task of breaking it down, either by argument or by the production of any direct counter-evidence? If I was mistaken, how was it that all of them contented themselves with discussing some of the words and deeds of a few of the Fathers, without condescending to take into consideration the vast and varied evidence for the supremacy of the Holy See as derived from the *consensus Patrum*, the acts and decrees of Œcumenical and Plenary Councils, and from the numerous extant letters of Popes and Emperors? A further question suggested itself to my mind, whether it was not manifest that several of my Reviewers had never even read or examined the book they pretended to criticise, for one of them at least counselled me to study Barrow's "Supremacy," being ignorant of the fact that a large

portion of my work was occupied in exposing (with some success, the *Guardian* admitted) his gross misquotations from the writings of the holy Fathers, and flagrant perversions of their testimony, to suit the object he had in view? Indeed, I went so far as to charge Dr. Barrow with downright dishonesty in the treatment of his subject, and no one ventured to say a word in his defence. Others, too, showed how superficially they had studied the work they criticised; for in presenting the case of S. Cyprian, and that of the quarrel with the Asiatic bishops about the time for celebrating the Paschal solemnity, they took no notice of what I wrote on those points in the chapters entitled "Audi Alteram Partem" in each division of my said work, which anticipated almost every point subsequently raised by them. In my judgment, by far the most honest of all the notices that have appeared on the Anglican side is that which is contained in the American *National Quarterly Review* of December, 1870, in which the writer, who is a "Protestant," "admits that a large amount of the testimony adduced by Mr. Lindsay in his book" ("The Evidence for the Papacy") "is of the highest character" (p. 197). This is more than any of my other Anglican Reviewers have had the generosity or the courage to admit. I am afraid it is too true that the great object of my Reviewers was, *coûte qui coûte*, to defend at all hazards, and by any means, the Anglican position against the Papal authority, without regard to that which is of infinitely higher importance—pure and unalloyed truth. In making these remarks I have no in-

tention of accusing my Criticisers of any conscious dishonesty; far from it. I am the last man who should do so, as I was once myself an Anglican, and had to defend positions much in the same manner, though unconscious at the time of any other than honest motives, but which, I now see, were utterly untenable. You know as well as I do (for it is a part of our present moral defection) that when men have a great object to gain, while making the most of the argument on their side, they are apt to overlook entirely the vital points on the opposite side, even when they are stated as clearly and as explicitly as language can express them. I am aware that some have accused me of this very fault in the work they have noticed, but none of them have ventured to point out, except in the most cursory manner, how I have erred in this respect. In my said work I adduced a vast quantity of evidence, voluminous and varied, which collectively proved the doctrine of the Papal Supremacy, —evidence couched in language so clear and precise, that the marvel is how any one could misunderstand its purport. What sane man is there who disputes the fact that the testimonies of all old English chronicles and histories prove that the kingdom of England has always been a monarchy; and yet is it not strange that evidence as thoroughly conclusive, but infinitely more copious, more decided, and far more ancient, is deemed by many insufficient to establish the fact that the Papacy is a divine Institution, designed by Almighty God as His appointed organ for governing and administering the Holy Catholic Church throughout the world? Now, as I have

already observed, this evidence none of my Criticisers have directly assailed: they have been contented to rest their case upon certain historical incidents, many of the circumstances of which are now unknown, and instead of boldly confronting that evidence, they seek, under the guise of a vast cloud of words, to divert the attention of their readers from the main question at issue, without a moment's consideration that the eternal weal or woe of thousands and thousands of thousands of apparently good people is involved in its true solution. If I, then, were disposed to reply to the strictures of my Reviewers, what should I have to answer? For have they demonstrated a single point of real importance that needs to be explained? Have they discovered even a flaw in the evidence or in the argument which might serve to overthrow the position maintained? Have they, moreover, attempted to prove that the Fathers contradict themselves on this question of the Papacy? As far as I have been able to understand my opponents, all that they have been able to do has been to express surprise that so little has been found in the writings of SS. Chrysostom, Augustine, Basil, &c., in favour of the Supremacy, and that the conduct of S. Cyprian and Firmilian was inconsistent with the notion either that they themselves held the doctrine, or that such doctrine could have been accepted as an essential part of the discipline of the Church in the times they lived. If they do not assert this in so many words, they most certainly imply it, and I shall now devote a space for its consideration.

§ 1.

The Case of S. Cyprian and Firmilian.

It seems that my Reviewers, or some of them, believe, that if such great and illustrious Fathers as S. Cyprian and Firmilian give publicity to sentiments hostile to the Pope, they necessarily deny the Papal Supremacy. It is superfluous to say that the Pope possesses two distinct characters, even as does the king of every country; viz., that which is personal to himself, and that which is official. A Pope may err in morals and discipline, as well as in matters of faith, when he acts simply as a private person or doctor; and even in his official acts, inclusive of questions concerning Faith, he may err, if he is not teaching *ex cathedra*, with the avowed intention of binding the Catholic conscience. It is open to any Bishop or other person to remonstrate with such Popes, and even to employ strong language, if deemed necessary for the attainment of the end in view. When S. Paul "withstood [S. Peter] to the face because he was to be blamed,"* did he thereby impeach his apostleship, and the fact of his being gifted with the privilege, I will not say of Supremacy, but of inspiration as an Apostle? So I venture to affirm that when great bishops censure the conduct of any Pope on any matter touching the administration of the Catholic Church, short of that which concerns *ex-cathedra* decrees relating to Faith, their act amounts to no proof whatever that they deny his Supremacy, or impugn his infalli-

* Gal. ii. 11.

bility as explained by the late decree of the Vatican Council.

Now with regard to S. Cyprian, there is but one passage imputed to him which seems to deny categorically the Papal Supremacy. This is the passage: "For no one of us setteth himself up as a Bishop of Bishops, nor by tyrannical terror forces his colleagues to a necessity for obeying; inasmuch as every bishop, in the free use of his liberty and power, has the right of forming his own judgment, and can no more be judged by another than can he himself judge another. But we must all await the judgment of our Lord Jesus Christ, who alone has the power both of setting us in the government of His Church, and of judging of our acts therein."*

With respect to this passage there are two points which are fatal to any use that can be made of it as evidence against the Papacy. First, S. Cyprian was at that time in error, if not in positive heresy, on the subject of Baptism. He held that Baptisms administered out of the Catholic Church were no baptisms at all, and that on admission into the Church, the persons who had been so baptized ought to be re-baptized, and this not conditionally, but absolutely. This heresy S. Stephen, the Supreme Pontiff, condemned, and threatened excommunication if persisted in. S. Cyprian did not at first submit to the Papal authority, and he wrote numerous letters condemning in strong language the conduct of the Pope, which he blamed especially in the Council of Carthage, over

* Opera S. Cyp., pp. 329, 330. Paris, 1726.

which he presided. Having fallen into one serious, indeed very serious error, his witness against the Papacy while under the influence of such heresy, and in the excitement of irritation, is simply worthless, and especially so when contradictory to his own testimony in favour of the Holy See, delivered by him at times when he was free from all error, and his mind in the enjoyment of that calmness and serenity so necessary for the right apprehension of all truth. The second point I would invite your attention to is that of the concluding sentence in the above passage, which contains sentiments subversive of all discipline in the Church. He not only denies the authority of the "Bishop of Bishops" over him, but of all bishops, making no exception in favour of bishops in provincial or general synod. He maintains that every bishop is free to "form his own judgment" on any matter he pleases; that he cannot be judged by another bishop; and that he is responsible for his acts solely to our Lord Jesus Christ, and then only at the last day. In a word, a bishop, according to S. Cyprian, may be a heretic and an apostate, and being responsible to no authority whatever, he cannot lawfully be deposed, and consequently the Faithful, to the ruin of many of them, would be compelled to submit to his authority, until the happy day should arrive when God Himself would remove him to the other world. The notion is so utterly preposterous, that had S. Augustine not given the whole of his speech *in extenso*, one would have concluded that it had been an interpolation, inserted in the acts of the Council of Carthage by some evil-disposed

person. Assuming that the passage is genuine, it witnesses to the fall of S. Cyprian into grievous error. It is presumed that this great Saint and martyr recovered himself, and before he died was reconciled to the Supreme Pontiff, and that he retracted the speech from which the above passage is an extract: this is more than probable, because the Roman Church has always regarded him as a saint, and inserted his name among the few mentioned in the Canon of the Mass. Be this as it may, his testimony against the Papal Supremacy is inadmissible: first, on account of his error concerning the doctrine of baptism; and secondly, because it is contradictory to what he had previously said when thoroughly orthodox.

It may be well to state again that evidence which he gave for the Papacy. In various letters and treatises he had, as I showed in my late work, taught that S. Peter was "chosen the first"* of the Apostles, that he "held the Primacy,"† that he was the Foundation and Source of the Catholic Church; that he was the representative of the Mother Church, from which were produced "seven Churches [*i. e.* the whole Catholic Church], herself [the Mother Church] having been founded, *first* and *alone*, by the voice of the Lord upon Peter."‡ From this it would appear that S. Cyprian taught, that the Church founded first and alone upon Peter was the one Mother Church, from whom issued the whole Church; and as everything in nature is for

* Ep. lxxi. ad Quint., p. 127. † *Ibid.*

‡ *Ibid.* De Exhort. Mart., p. 270. See also Ep. lv. ad Corn., p. 83.

ever subject to its root, so the whole Church ever remains subject to that one root—*i. e.* the Church of Peter, which Church is the Mother Church, to which they are "conjoined." S. Cyprian held that all the Apostles were equal, but they were equal on the principle of cohesion to S. Peter, and of recognition of the supreme jurisdiction S. Peter had received from Christ. This is indicated by the great stress S. Cyprian lays upon the authority of the one single Chair; for he says, "There is one God, one Lord, and one Faith, and one Church, and one Chair, founded by the word of the Lord on the Rock,"* and that Rock he held was S. Peter,† because he had asserted that the Church was founded and built upon him. That one "Chair" he distinguished as the "Sacerdotal Chair,"‡ a distinction he never gave to any other Chair; and that Chair he regarded as the source of the unity of the Priesthood. And with respect to the Successors of S. Peter in "that Sacerdotal Chair," he points out that this Chair was and is in Rome, and that the Bishops of Rome occupy that Chair, which is "the place of Peter." Hence in his letters to Pope S. Cornelius, warning him against certain heretics and schismatics, he recites the fact that this the Roman Church is "the Principal or Ruling Church," where is "the Chair of Peter, whence the unity of the Priesthood took its rise";§ and he further affirms that the Roman

* *Ib.* Ep. xl. ad Pleb., p. 53.
† *Ib.* De Exhort. Martyr., p. 270.
‡ *Ib.* Ep. lii. ad Anton., p. 68.
§ *Ib.* Ep. lv. ad Cornel., p. 86.

Church is "the Root and Womb of the Catholic Church."*

As a proof that S. Cyprian really held the Roman Pontiffs to be the Supreme Bishops of the Catholic Church, he, when in exile,† admitted the authority of the clergy of Rome, during the vacancy of the Holy See, to superintend the spiritual affairs of his province; and he asserted it unequivocally when he petitioned Pope S. Stephen (the very Pope with whom he afterwards had the misfortune to differ) to proceed against Marcianus, Bishop of Arles in France, and to decree his deposition, and the appointment of another to be in his room.‡

To oppose against this array of testimony a single speech, spoken at a moment of extreme irritation, and while he was labouring under error on a cardinal point of doctrine; a speech which contained sentiments heretical and subversive of all discipline and good government, is utterly indefensible: so much so, that if the cause had concerned a civil question, no regularly-constituted court would admit it as evidence.

With respect to Firmilian, it is impossible to read his letter to S. Cyprian without perceiving he was a man of an irascible temper. His language towards the Pope is disrespectful and intemperate, and, moreover, it is inconsistent. He admits S. Peter's position, and he does not deny that S. Stephen was

* *Ib.* Ep. xlv. ad Cornel., p. 59.

† *Ib.* Ep. ii. Cleri Rom. ad Clerum Carth., pp. 7, 8; Ep. xiv. ad Presb. et Diac. Romæ, p. 23; Ep. xxii. ad Clerum Romæ, p. 31; Ep. xxx. Presb. et Diac. Romæ ad Cyp., p. 40.

‡ *Ib.* Ep. lxvii. ad Steph., p. 115.

his Successor, not only in the See of Rome, but in the position or place of Peter in the Catholic hierarchy. This admission is the more valuable because he would not have lost the opportunity of denying the Pope's position in the Church had it been possible.

§ 2.

Case of Apiarius.

The Apiarian controversy is likewise nothing but an ecclesiastical ghost, which dissolves on contact. The point at issue was one of pure discipline, as I showed in my work. It is simply impossible to prove that this amounted even to a protest against the Holy See, without stultifying the whole African Church. A few years before the Council of Carthage, A.D. 410, had sent their Decrees to Rome for confirmation, the synodical epistle requesting the Pope to add to them "the authority of the Apostolic See";* and the Council of Milevis, in Africa, A.D. 416, in making a similar request, said: "We pray that you will deign to extend your pastoral diligence to the great dangers of us poor weak members of Christ. . . . . We think that . . . . they who hold such perverse sentiments will more readily yield to the authority of your Holiness, which is derived from the clear light of the Scriptures."† Considering that the Council which condemned Apiarius for immoral conduct was held

* Galland., t. viii. Ep. xxvi. pp. 590, 591.

† Labbe, S. Concil., t. iii. coll. 388-9.

only a few years after the two above-named Councils and composed of many of the same bishops, it is impossible to suppose that in protesting against the Pope's action in this affair, and his claim to hear appeals on lesser causes, the Fathers meant to deny his Supremacy over the whole Church, seeing that they had previously, within a few years, admitted it to the full. It is strange that Anglicans cannot perceive that this mode of controversy is libellous and suicidal: libellous, in that they make the Fathers contradict themselves, both in word and action; and suicidal, in that they completely annihilate their credit for consistency and veracity. My Reviewers accuse me of quoting the Fathers to suit my own purpose, but I appeal to them whether they do not do so in a hundredfold greater degree. I, for my part, quoted what they plainly assert respecting the Supremacy, and in commenting on what they say and do against some particular Pope, I attempt to show, and I think with some success (for my opponents do not assert the contrary), that their proceedings were directed not against the authority of the Holy See, but against some special and personal act of the reigning Pontiff, having no reference to his *ex-cathedra* decrees: whereas Anglicans in their mode of argument make the Fathers inconsistent with themselves, inconsistent with the tradition of the Church, and at variance with the acts of Œcumenical Councils, and this mainly by declining to test their proceedings by the standard of their direct assertions in favour of the Supremacy of S. Peter and his Successors to his chair. I entered largely on these

points in my late work, but my Reviewers, for the most part, have taken no notice of them.

§ 3.

The Case of S. Meletius and Paulinus at Antioch.

I confess I never could understand how the strife between these two great hierarchs for the Chair of Antioch can furnish any proof against the Roman Supremacy. It was not a schism in the ordinary sense of the term; it was not the setting up of a rival chair against that of S. Peter at Rome and of S. Ignatius (successor of S. Peter in this See) of Antioch. It was an internal quarrel, arising out of dissensions which were entirely local. It bore no sort of resemblance to the Donatist schism, nor to that of the Greek Church, nor that of the Anglican communion. S. Meletius had originally been an Arian or semi-Arian, and the Arians of Antioch, believing him to be one of their party, joined in his election, but discovering their mistake immediately afterwards, strove to get rid of him. On the other hand, the Catholics did not desire that one who had been tainted with Arianism should be their bishop, and so they chose Paulinus, who seems to have met with the approval of some of the Western bishops. And so it turned out that two orthodox bishops found themselves elected to the See of Antioch, each believing himself to have been legitimately chosen. The quarrel lasted many years, and greatly distracted the Church of Syria.

Anglicans consider this quarrel to be fatal to the Supremacy of the Holy See, because (1) the Pope, if he were really Supreme Bishop, could easily have determined the dispute: (2) because it being against the canon law for two bishops to occupy the same episcopal chair, one of them must necessarily have been out of the communion of the Holy See: and (3) because S. Meletius, being, as is alleged, not in communion with Rome, presided at the second General Council.

To each of these points the following remarks appear to me apposite.

1. It is true that the Pope could have determined the controversy if he had exercised his authority;* but before dismissing this point, we must ascertain, if possible, why he did not do so. Our great difficulty in forming a correct judgment on this matter is the want of reliable information concerning all the facts and surrounding circumstances of the case. But did the contemporary bishops in the East and West themselves clearly understand the merits of the case, and the true nature of the claims of those two men to the See of Antioch?

* That this is no mere assertion, let me refer to a letter of S. Ambrose to Theophilus, Patriarch of Alexandria, on the scandal at Antioch: he says, "We are of opinion most surely, that reference should be made to our holy brother the Priest [Bishop] of the Roman Church, since we presume that you will come to such a decision as cannot be displeasing to him . . . . if that be determined on by your counsel which may not create disunion in our communion; that so we also, on receiving the series of your decrees, we learning that you have done what the Roman Church will doubtless approve of, may with joy reap also the fruit of your examination."—(Opera S. Amb. Ep. 56, Theophil., n. 7.)

If we may judge from the historians of the period, there was much disputation and misunderstanding concerning this question. But if the Pope could have settled the matter himself, say Anglicans, he would by his own motion have determined the controversy. Anglicans seem to think that the Pope may depose a regularly constituted bishop without cause; but this is a mistake. The Pope is bound in conscience to exercise righteous judgment, and pronounce sentence according to the testimony before him. Now, although both these prelates and their supporters appealed to Rome, yet on account of the contradictory evidence and counter assertions laid before the Pontiff, it was extremely difficult for him to decide the case. That this must necessarily have been so is clear from the fact that the great S. Athanasius and S. Epiphanius and the West took the part of Paulinus, while S. Basil and other eminent Fathers supported the claims of S. Meletius. I think this fairly meets the first objection, viz., that the Pope could easily have determined the dispute.

2. It is maintained that one of the rival bishops, according to the terms of ecclesiastical law, could not have been in communion with Rome. Under the circumstances of the case, not so. Here were two bishops elected by the Church of Antioch, and their supporters both maintained the canonicity of the election, and the confusion was so great, that it was most difficult to determine which was the true bishop. S. Jerome in his letter to Pope S. Damasus complains of the impossibility of his coming to a conclusion on the point, and he

petitions the Pope to inform him with whom he is to be in communion.* Clearly until the claims of the two rival Patriarchs should be adjudged, neither of them (for both were orthodox †) were out of communion with the Holy See. The case was happily exceptional, and consequently its treatment was necessarily exceptional. It is alleged, however, that the Pope supported the claims of Paulinus, but I think this is very doubtful; certainly S. Jerome, who had formerly been secretary to the Pope, and who frequently corresponded with him, was not aware of the fact. In a letter addressed to the Pope, he says, "I know not Vitalis; I repudiate Meletius; I am a stranger to Paulinus." ‡ And in a subsequent letter he wrote, "Meletius, Vitalis, and Paulinus, all assert that they adhere to thee: I might assent, if only one of them declared this: as it is, either two, or all of them are liars. Wherefore I beseech your Holiness, by the Cross of the Lord, you would, by your letter, make known to me with whom I ought to hold communion in Syria." § Whether the Pope himself inclined towards Paulinus or not is immaterial, but it seems evident that up to the time S. Jerome wrote his second letter, the Pope had given no decision.

The matter was then evidently in abeyance, and until it should be decided, it could not be asserted, with any truth, that one of these bishops was out of the Pope's communion. Indeed S. Jerome re-

* Opera S. Hieron., t. i. Ep. xvi. ad Dam. n. 2.

† Vide Opera S. Basil., t. iii. Ep. cclviii. ad Ephan. n. 3.

‡ S. Hieron., Ep. xv. ad Dam. n. 2.

§ *Ib.* Ep. xvi. ad Dam. n. 2.

cites the fact that all three claimed to be in communion with the Holy See.* It will probably be argued that because S. Jerome asserts that two of these prelates, or all of them, must be liars, on the ground that there could not be more than one bishop in the same chair at the same time, two of them were necessarily in a state of schism; but however theoretically true this may be, yet, as I observed above, it was an exceptional case, and S. Jerome not being on the spot, may not then have been qualified rightly to estimate the difficulty of the case. Certain it is that both Meletius and Paulinus continued bishops in Antioch, and both were ultimately recognized by Rome.

3. The third point, viz., that S. Meletius not being in communion with the Holy See, did, nevertheless, preside over the second Œcumenical Council, which, it is alleged, would have been impossible if the Holy See had been recognized as the Supreme Head of all Churches. In the first place, not only is there no evidence to show that S. Meletius was not in communion with Rome, but there is some at least existing which indicates that he was in communion with that See. Mr. Rhodes, in his admirable work on "the Visible Unity of the Church," thus writes: "About two years prior to the second general council, an important synod was assembled at Antioch. Its acts, which were afterwards deposited in the archives of the Roman Church, afford a more formal proof than even the above-mentioned letter [of S. Ambrose] of the fact

* S. Hieron., Ep. xvi. ad Dam. n. 2.

that the communion of S. Meletius was at that time fully acknowledged by the Roman See; and, as it would appear, his position as Bishop of Antioch, also. S. Gregory of Nyssa states that he was present at this synod, and that it assembled nine months or a little more after the death of S. Basil the Great; consequently about the month of September, A.D. 379. The second general council at which Meletius presided at Constantinople, and during which he died, took place in the year 381. In the aforesaid synod of Antioch, A.D. 379, S. Meletius and the bishops assembled under him subscribed to a synodical letter or exposition of faith (of which fragments are still extant), which had been drawn up in a Roman synod held under Pope S. Damasus during the preceding year. This document is distinct both in its date and its subject from another synodical epistle which is sometimes prefixed to it; but which is actually the copy of one addressed to the bishops of Illyricum, by a former Roman synod held under S. Damasus, A.D. 372, and sent to Illyricum by the hands of Sabinus, a deacon of Milan. Sabinus afterwards proceeded as legate to the East with a copy of the epistle, addressed from Damasus and others assembled in Rome 'to the Catholic bishops throughout the East.' A reply was immediately returned to Rome, expressing entire assent on the part of Meletius and other Eastern bishops. In the collections of councils these two documents are not unfrequently placed together, under a date considerably earlier than that of the later one, which should properly be given as belonging to the

Antiochian synod of the year 379, by which it was accepted in the East. At the same time it is by no means impossible that the former epistle also, may have been formally signed in conjunction with the latter, by the bishops of the same synod of Antioch, A.D. 379, in fuller confirmation of the assent which they had previously expressed to it.* It will suffice for the present purpose to recite the paragraph appended by the synod of Antioch, A.D. 379, to the exposition of faith of the Roman synod, held A.D. 378; with the signatures of Meletius and the other bishops, and the notification that they were deposited in the Roman archives. The following is a literal translation: 'Here ends this epistle or exposition of the Roman synod held under Damasus the Pope, and transmitted to the East, in which all the Eastern Church, a synod having been convened at Antioch, believing with one accordant faith, and all so consenting to the same faith above set forth, confirm this each with his subscription.' Then follow the signatures: 'I, Meletius, Bishop of Antioch, consent to all things above written, so believing and thinking; and if any one holds opinions contrary to these doctrines, let him be anathema.' S. Eusebius, Bishop of Samosata, Pelagius of Laodicæa, Zeno of Tyre, Eulogius of Edessa, Rematius of Mallo, and Diodorus of Tarsus, subscribe after him to the same effect, and it is added,—'In like manner also cxlvi other Eastern bishops subscribed, whose

* "Both of these epistles," says Mr. Rhodes in a note, "may be found amongst the Epistolæ Romanorum Pontificum of Dom. Constant. Paris, 1721, coll. 477–500."

subscription in the original is now preserved in the archives of the Roman Church. Here ends the Roman and Antiochian synod.' This proves, beyond doubt, that the communion of Meletius was then recognized by Rome; and it is to be observed that the signature of Meletius thus formally accepted, bears the title of Bishop of Antioch, *episcopus Antiochenus*."* This evidence appears to me conclusive that S. Meletius was in communion with the Holy See at least two years before the celebration of the second council; and not only so, but that he was recognized as the "Bishop of Antioch." This is evident (1) from the fact that on the very face of this document he was admitted to be the Bishop of Antioch by the 150 bishops assembled in the council, which would hardly have been the case if he had called himself by a title to which he had no right: (2) from the circumstance of the presence of the Legate, who would not have accepted this description of himself, or even allowed him to sit as such in the synod, if it had not been true: and (3) from the circumstance that by subscribing to the exposition of faith of the Roman synod, he proved himself to be *ipso facto* united in faith with the Supreme Pontiff.

It is true, after the death of Meletius, the internal schism continued, but the Pope in the first instance condemned the intruder Flavian and recognized Paulinus as the legitimate bishop.

* Rhodes's "Visible Unity of the Catholic Church," vol. i. pp. 333–335. London, 1870.

I have occupied more space on this question than it is worth. If you wish to study further the history and facts of this miserable scandal, I would refer you to Mr. Rhodes's admirable work, from which I have already quoted, vol. i. pp. 243–341.

CHAPTER III.

"REPRESENTATIVE MEN."

THE *Guardian* of the 31st August, 1870, in its review of the work entitled "The Evidence for the Papacy," informs its readers that "we proceed to look, as we promised, at the testimony of some representative men, such as (1) S. Leo, (2) S. Jerome, (3) S. Basil, (4) S. Augustine, and (5) S. Chrysostom." It is a relief to have something tangible to deal with, some definite points raised to dispose of, and some difficulties (for there are difficulties concerning every dogma of religion,—for if there were none, our holy religion would cease to be a mysterious one) brought to light, to be explained. The Reviewer in this weekly journal could not have selected better examples than the above-named, as their writings furnish us with the best illustrations of both the weakness (so to speak) and the strength of the Papal position in the Catholic Church. I proceed now to consider the several important points raised by my Reviewer.

§ 1.

Pope S. Leo and the Œcumenical Councils.

The *Guardian* admits that S. Leo did put forth claims, on behalf of himself as the Successor of

S. Peter, which he says are "probably among the strongest that can be adduced," and he adds further on in his notice, "who became, under God, the chief instrument in the overthrow of the Nestorian and Eutychian heresies; and we feel most grateful to a living divine, Canon Bright, for his valuable translation of S. Leo's sermons on the Incarnation. But as regards his testimony on behalf of a Papal supremacy, we maintain that it has been contradicted by a higher authority than that of any one man, however eminent—namely, by the voice of two great gatherings accepted throughout Christendom as œcumenical—the Council of Constantinople, and the Council of Chalcedon."* Let us consider the above under two aspects.

I. Anglicans frequently remind us that S. Gregory the Great denounced the notion of any one aspiring to be an Œcumenical Bishop as wicked and antichristian. They quote the following and other kindred passages from this great Pope as an exhaustive testimony against the doctrine of the Papal Supremacy: "I confidently say, that whosoever doth call himself Universal Bishop, or desireth to be so called, doth in his elation forerun antichrist, because he arrogantly sets up himself before all others." The *Guardian* says "that S. Leo's claims to Papal Supremacy are probably among the strongest that can be adduced." Therefore it is maintained that S. Leo regarded himself as "Universal Bishop;" and inasmuch as he claimed an authority which the *Guardian* declares was opposed

* The *Guardian*, Aug. 31, 1870.

to the voice of two Œcumenical Councils, he was in his elation or pride a forerunner of antichrist, and an arrogant usurper of the rights of other bishops. But he was guilty of a far greater crime (if Anglicans are right) than even this, for he aspired to the throne of Jesus Christ upon earth, claiming to be His special Vicar or Representative, and to be armed with that plenary jurisdiction which appertains to Christ as the one King and Priest over the Household of God. Assuming that the Papal Supremacy is a doctrine contrary to Scripture, and the Catholic Church; contrary to the constitution Christ delivered to the Church, what was S. Leo but a heretic of the deepest dye, for he persisted in holding an opinion contradicted by two great Œcumenical Councils; a schismatic, in that he was a cause of many divisions; a blasphemer, for he placed himself in his pride on the same level (so to speak) with Jesus Christ; and a forerunner of antichrist, inasmuch as he was preparing the way for the advent of the son of perdition. This is the position which the *Guardian* is compelled to accept as that of S. Leo, whose claims for Supremacy, he says, are among "the strongest that have been adduced."

1. To this man then, this arch-heretic and impostor—*i. e.* in the Anglican view—we are gravely told the Catholic Church is indebted for being "the chief instrument in the overthrow of the Nestorian and Eutychian heresies." Is not this a most strange and unheard-of paradox, a heretic to be the vindicator of truth, the "forerunner of antichrist," the champion of Jesus Christ;

the proud usurper of every right divine and human, the determined foe of the evil one, whose counsels he is alleged to be obeying! Yes, strange, impossible paradox—a paradox which could never have been invented except by one who is without the Catholic pale. A heretic to be the destroyer of heresy, antichrist to be the defender of Christ, and a wolf to be the guardian of the purity of the fold, is indeed an idea most difficult to comprehend; and this is what Anglicans in general, and my Reviewer in particular, are understood to hold with respect to S. Leo, whose supreme authority they believe to be antichristian. How can an obstinate heretic be the great destroyer of heresy? Who ever heard of such a thing? Can a single example be found in Scripture, or in the history of the Catholic Church, of any obstinate traducer of divine truth having been employed by God the Holy Ghost as the great destroyer of heresy? What is a heretic? He is one who, in defiance of the authority of the Catholic Church, deliberately maintains an opinion on some point of religion, and attempts to draw others to his side. Such a one is a wicked man, who, as S. Paul tells us, "shall not inherit the Kingdom of God."* Can it be believed, then, that God would employ such a one as His great instrument in the overthrow of one of the most subtle heresies that ever afflicted the Catholic Church? This is a dilemma from which the *Guardian* cannot escape. If the Pope be no more than an ordinary bishop he would be liable to fall into deadly heresy,

* Gal. v. 21.

like Nestorius of old, and to issue decrees contrary to sound doctrine; but it is incredible to suppose that God would employ such a one—a heretic, a usurper, and an antichrist—to be the chief instrument for the overthrow of damnable heresy. For "Satan to cast out Satan" is declared by our Lord to be an absurdity; so, for a heretic to cast out heresy is as great an absurdity. Catholics understand how to distinguish the Pope from the Chair in which he sits; they know that when he decrees *ex cathedra*, *i.e.* by the authority of the Chair, he cannot err. But Anglicans cannot plead this privilege for the Pope, and they are therefore driven to the impossible position, that the Church is indebted to one of the greatest heretics of the day—to one who claims without right (in Anglican opinion) the supreme jurisdiction of Jesus Christ, and in defiance of the opinion of two Œcumenical Councils—for the overthrow of the Nestorian and Eutychian heresies.

2. Now let us take another view of this question. May it not be at least probable that he who did such immense service to the Church, who was so evidently called by God to deliver the Church, whose knowledge of the great doctrine of the Incarnation was so profound as to enable him to prepare and to write that wonderful tome, which so amazed the assembled Fathers at Chalcedon as to force from them the loud exclamation, "Peter has thus spoken by Leo,"—I say, if such was his deep knowledge of the depths of the doctrine of the Incarnation of our Lord, is it probable he was ignorant of the true position which he, as Bishop of Rome, filled in the hierarchy of the Catholic

Church? There are two hypotheses which may be assumed by the *Guardian;* either that S. Leo was ignorant of the truth, or that, knowing the truth, as Anglicans interpret it, he, in defiance of the true doctrine and of "the voice of two Œcumenical Councils," being elated with pride and arrogance, claimed to be the Head and Lord of the Catholic Church upon earth and the Master of the Household. If the latter hypothesis, then S. Leo was nothing less than a very wicked man, a heretic, a usurper, and an antichrist. But the Reviewer in the *Guardian* professes to have the highest veneration for this Pope, and expresses his gratitude to a learned Anglican divine for publishing in English his wonderful sermon on the Incarnation. This Reviewer, too, acknowledges he was a saint—a canonized saint—and therefore he could not have been, in his estimation, such a wicked, ambitious impostor as he implies in his criticisms on "The Evidence for the Papacy." In truth, he is sorely puzzled: he admits, on the one hand, the greatness and the sanctity of S. Leo, and the service he rendered to the Church, and on the other hand deliberately charges him with claiming a position which is declared to be "contradicted by the voice of two Œcumenical Councils." How can the *Guardian* reconcile these contrary positions? I suppose he will fall back on the first hypothesis, and assert that S. Leo sinned ignorantly, not being aware of the truth, *i. e.* he was mistaken in his belief of his own position in the Catholic hierarchy. But here arises a very great difficulty: he had already proved his deep and profound knowledge of the doctrine

of the Incarnation of our Lord; is it probable that he was ignorant of any essential point arising from that doctrine? For what is the hierarchy but a branch of the doctrine of the Incarnation? We know that the Sacraments issued from the side of our Lord, and we are all aware that when the hierarchy was erected, Christ vivified it by the immortal Breath of His glorified body, as described by S. John, saying, "He BREATHED on them," and said, "Receive ye the Holy Ghost."* Is it probable, then, that so great a theologian, so deep a thinker, so profound a scholar in divine things, could possibly have been ignorant of the constitution of the hierarchy, which was thus created and vivified by the Lord Himself, and quickened with a never-dying life by the Holy Ghost on the day of Pentecost? It seems to me impossible. What, then, are we to conclude? Surely that he who proved himself so thoroughly imbued with the knowledge of the doctrine of the Incarnation could not be ignorant of the constitution of that hierarchy which was established by Christ, the character of which was indelibly imprinted upon it when He breathed upon it its immortal principle; and therefore being (as is conceded) so holy a man, and consequently incapable of usurping a dignity which did not appertain either to him or his Chair, we are forced to the inevitable conclusion that the claim to Supremacy which he put forth and exercised was really and truly founded on the divine law and institution of Christ.

* S. John xx. 22.

It now remains to be ascertained whether the alleged fact is true, that the strong claims to "a Papal Supremacy" were "contradicted by the voice of two great gatherings accepted as œcumenical throughout Christendom,—the Council of Constantinople and the Council of Chalcedon." And this brings us to the second part of this question.

II. When the Reviewer in the *Guardian* penned the above words, he must have been perusing such works as Hammond's "Six Œcumenical Councils," or "Definitions and Canons of the First Four Councils," published at Oxford, otherwise he never would have committed himself to such an untrue statement.

Let us then examine the acts and decrees of these two Œcumenical Councils, and one other,—a most important one—that which stands between, viz. the Œcumenical Council of Ephesus.

1. And first with respect to the Council of Constantinople. The *Guardian* says, "The second Œcumenical Council had been summoned in A.D. 381 by the Emperor Theodosius, and, as Mr. Lindsay frankly admits, '*the Pope was not present at this Council, nor did he send representatives;*' so that a kingdom on the Ultramontane theory, was assembled in council by its representatives, without the presence of the sovereign, either in person or by commission!"* The Reviewer is wrong in his facts. This Council was not *at first* an Œcumenical Council, it was nothing more than a large Oriental Council, and therefore it was not "a kingdom

* The *Guardian*, Aug. 31, 1870.

assembled in council." Its relation, in the *first instance*, was to the Church Universal what a great assembly or court of magistrates is to the Parliament or to the Privy Council: binding in law, within its proper sphere of operation. This Council became Œcumenical subsequently, on the decrees being accepted by the West and confirmed by the Pope. I grant that there are no letters extant from the Pope to be found in the acts as they have come down to us of this Council, and in that of Nicæa, confirming the decrees of these Councils. Why? I reply, because the acts of these Councils are for the most part lost. But if you will look at the acts of the two next Œcumenical Councils, all or most of the acts of which have been preserved, you will find these papal letters confirming what the Fathers decreed. And with regard to the summoning authority for convoking Œcumenical Councils, it is evident that the Pope's position was recognized. The Emperors Marcian and Valentinian III., in their letters to the Pope S. Leo, alluding to the convocation of the Œcumenical Council of Chalcedon, expressly say that it was about "to be assembled by your authority." * And as respects the Council of Nicæa, it is asserted by the sixth Œcumenical Council, that it "was assembled by Constantine always Augustus, and [Pope] Silvester of praiseworthy memory." † It is clear then that the Emperors were not the sole conveners of Œcumenical Councils, but they, as

* Opera S. Leon., inter Ep. Leon., Ep. lxxiii. t. i. col. 899. Migne.

† Hard. Act. Concil. Collect., t. iii. col. 1418.

representing the universal secular polity, and the Pope as the chief authority of the Universal Church, together exercised this office, and this for obvious reasons; viz., that each was necessary to the other in those days; that is to say, the Emperors required the sanction and authority of the Pope, as Marcian and Valentinian acknowledged, for summoning such councils, and the Pope needed the assistance of the Emperors to enable the Councils to meet.

With regard to the alleged fact that the high pretensions of the Pope were "contradicted by the voice of two great gatherings accepted throughout Christendom as œcumenical,—the Council of Constantinople and the Council of Chalcedon," if my Reviewer would examine the decrees of the Council of Constantinople and the acts and decrees of the Council of Chalcedon, he will find he is mistaken. In the Œcumenical Council of Constantinople I cannot discern one word against the Pope's claim. The Canon relied upon is the third, which simply affirms "that the Bishop of Constantinople has the dignity of honour next after the Bishop of Rome, for Constantinople is New Rome." The reason given for the primacy of Old Rome is not here stated, nor is it necessarily implied. If the Primacy of Old Rome depended simply upon its dignity as the former imperial city, then I cannot understand why the Primacy was not transferred to New Rome when it became the seat of government and the residence of the Emperor and court. Anglicans are constantly reminding us that the honour of the Bishop of Rome was not divine in its origin, but on account of the dignity of the

city. If so, it is natural to suppose that on the translation of the seat of government to Constantinople the honour of the Primacy would likewise, as a matter of course, have been translated to the see of the new capital, for as you must be aware, in those ancient times it was the policy of the Church to select the chief cities of the empire as the seats of her patriarchs, primates, and metropolitans, and therefore it is inconceivable that the Roman Bishop should have retained his primacy if that primacy had been conceded to him simply on account of the secular dignity of the city. There must then have been some other reason for this primacy than that of the honour and dignity of Rome. What was it? The Empress Galla Placidia, writing to her son, the Emperor Theodosius, says, she saw the Pope "adoring at the altar of the Martyr" (S. Peter), and that "he was surrounded by many bishops, whom, on account of the Princedom or Dignity peculiar to the place, he had assembled from the numerous cities of Italy." * Here is a glimpse of the papal court, the Pope, attended not by deacons or by priests merely, but by bishops; somewhat analogous in the secular order to the position of our own Sovereign, who is waited upon not only by ordinary men but by dukes, earls, and barons. The "dignity of the place,"—that is, not merely the city of Rome, but the See, even the See of the Martyr Peter, at whose altar she saw the Pope adoring: indeed the court of

* Opera S. Leon., inter Ep. Leon., t. i. Ep. lvi. coll. 859–862. Migne.

the Pope, composed ordinarily of bishops, indicates that the peculiarity of the dignity thus honoured was religious and not civil, ecclesiastical, not secular. This is evident from what she says further on in her letter, when alluding to the confusion then troubling the Church, she asserts the necessity of preserving "immaculate" the true faith, "which should be accomplished "in accordance with the form and definition of the Apostolic See, which we both [*i. e.* Galla Placidia and her son, the Emperor Theodosius] venerate as of surpassing [authority]."* Whence then that "surpassing authority?"—was it on account of the dignity of the city of Rome? Certainly not; it was primarily because of "the Apostolic See" there located, which gave to the Pontiff that princedom or dignity peculiar to the place (*i. e.* the Apostolic See), which required him to be surrounded, as his position necessitated, by the highest officers of the Church, viz. bishops. To make this matter more clear, let me refer you to a letter of Theodosius and Valentinian III., who thus wrote: "Since, therefore, the authority of the sacred synod has made firm the Primacy of the Apostolic See, on account of the merit of Peter, Chief of the corona of bishops, and of the dignity of the city of Rome, let no one presumptuously dare to attempt anything unlawful in opposition to the authority of that [*i. e.* the Apostolic] See."† We have here a direct statement of the fact that the Primacy of the Pope was not merely because Rome was the Imperial

* Opera S. Leon., inter Ep. Leon., t. i. Ep. lvi. coll. 859–862. Migne.

† *Ib.* Ep. xi. col. 637.

city, but because of the "Merit of Peter," who by his confession of faith, merited to become the foundation and the Head of the Church, and as a consequence his see became the Chair of authority in the Catholic Church. The dignity then that was "peculiar to the place," was derived in the first instance from S. Peter, whose See was situated in old Rome; which for that reason the Catholic Emperors delighted to honour with all such rights and privileges as it was in their power to bestow upon it. Now Constantinople, as a see, had no claim whatever, on ecclesiastical grounds, to be elevated to the second rank in the Catholic hierarchy. It was not an apostolic see, nor had it been aforetime a place of any great importance. But now a change had taken place; the capital of the world had been translated from old Rome to Constantinople, and this place became the seat of government, and therefore it was deemed necessary that the see should be promoted to the highest possible dignity, short only of that of the Apostolic See, and the Fathers express in the canon the reason of this elevation; viz., "because Constantinople was New Rome." This reason for the change, which it was necessary to state, amounts to no implication whatever that the dignity of the first See was on account of that of the ancient capital of the world. I am aware that the Council of Chalcedon seems to assert the contrary—that I will consider presently; but so far as the Œcumenical Council of Constantinople is concerned, the Fathers said not one word in disparagement of the Supremacy of the Pope; on the contrary, an inci-

dent in the history of that Council witnesses to his supreme authority over the very see they were elevating to the second rank in the Catholic hierarchy.

Upon the resignation of S. Gregory of Constantinople, while this Council was sitting, the see became vacant, and a new patriarch had to be appointed. The Fathers of the Council recommended to the Emperor certain persons whom "they thought worthy of the See," and the Emperor chose Nectarius, much to their surprise, but they, after presenting some objections, ultimately yielded to the wishes of the Emperor, and then we read that Theodosius sent deputies from his court, *with certain bishops*, to desire a formal letter from the Pope in confirmation of their choice of Nectarius." * Here is a distinct recognition of the Pope's Prerogative to confirm bishops in their sees, and apparently by the very Council which it is alleged as contradicting by anticipation the claim of S. Leo in the succeeding century. I am aware the authenticity of this incident is disputed by Anglicans, but Fleury, who, being a Gallican, was not disposed to concede to the Supreme Pontiff more than he believed to be his due, gives it as an historical fact, so that there can scarcely be any reasonable doubt that this incident in the history of the Council actually took place. As I observed above, most of the acts of this Council are lost, and therefore it is

* Fleury's Eccles. Hist., l. xviii. c. 5; Herbert's Tr., vol. ii. pp. 524, 525.

impossible to ascertain positively whether the story is true, and I must add equally impossible for opponents to disprove. But I do not lay any stress upon this point, for my position is that the Council of Constantinople did not either directly or indirectly, explicitly or implicitly, contradict the claims for any such Papal Supremacy as was subsequently made by S. Leo the Great.

But there is an expression in the synodical letter of this Council to the Pope, S. Damasus, and the West, which must not be overlooked, for it affords some evidence of the recognition of the claims of the Roman Chair to superiority of authority over the affairs of the Eastern portion of the Catholic Church. In that letter the Fathers say, ". . . you have manifested to us your brotherly love, as is signified in the letters of your most pious Emperor, by inviting us to attend as your members at the Council which you intend, according to God's will, to hold in Rome."* What did the Fathers mean by the words "your members"? or rather, what interpretation ought to be put upon these words, according to the opinions of primitive times? We know the phraseology often employed in those days by the Popes; as, for example, S. Damasus,—". . . as regards the institutes of our forefathers that you cease not, as the custom ever has been, to refer all things, which can admit of any doubt, to us, as to the Head";† S. Siricius,—"We have explained, dearest brother, all the points which

* Theod. H. E., l. v. c. 9.

† Labbe's Concil., Ep. v. Prospero Numid. et aliis, t. ii. col. 1025.

. . . . you have referred to the Roman Church as the Head of your body";* S. Anastasius,—"Certainly care will not be wanting on my part to guard the faith of the Gospel as regards my peoples, and to visit by letter, as far as I am able, the parts of my body throughout the divers regions of the earth."† Such was the language of Popes who lived within the century in which the great Œcumenical Council of Constantinople was celebrated, and they testify to the fact that each Pope believes himself to be the Head, and the bishops in the various regions of the earth the members or parts of his body. Bearing in mind, then, that this was the fixed idea in the mind of every Pope, that he was the Head, and that this was well known to be the case in the whole Church, what did the Fathers of this Council mean when they described themselves in their epistle to Pope S. Damasus as "your members"? This term is one which necessarily implies a Headship; for where there are members of a body there must be a Head; and where there is a Head, there must of course be members. Whom did the Fathers of the Second Œcumenical Council recognize as their Head? The answer is to be found in the synodical epistle of the Œcumenical Council of Chalcedon to Pope S. Leo,—"Over whom thou indeed hast presided as the Head over the members."‡ This is a recognition on the part of both East and West of the Pope as Head, and of the bishops of the world as his

* Galland., t. vii. p. 536. † *Ib.* t. viii. p. 248.
‡ Labbe's Concil., t. iv. col. 1775.

members. I might be reminded that the synodical epistle of Constantinople was addressed to other bishops of Italy besides the Pope; therefore it will be maintained that the Eastern bishops were members of the West. No doubt that is true in a sense, which I will explain further on when replying to the strictures of the *Guardian* on a point similar to this; but in the meanwhile, let me refer to the Roman Synod of A.D. 378 (three years before the Council of Constantinople was held), respecting the relationship between the Pope and the bishops: "Let not our above-named Brother Damasus be made inferior to these, to whom he is equal in office, yet does he excel them by the Prerogative of the Apostolic See."* As a bishop he is equal to all the bishops in order of priesthood, but as Pope he is, by virtue of the Prerogatives attached to the Apostolic See, superior to all, being the Head, and the bishops in every part of the world his "members." It cannot, then, be asserted that the Œcumenical Council of Constantinople contradicts the claims of Pope S. Leo to be the Supreme Pontiff of the Universal Church.

2. The Œcumenical Councils of Ephesus and Chalcedon (the latter of which the *Guardian* asserts contradicts the claims of S. Leo) prove demonstratively that the Primacy of Rome was not on account merely of the dignity of the Imperial city, but because it was an institution of divine appointment. The 28th canon is that to which Anglicans

* *Vide* Fleury, H. E., l. xvii. c. xli.

and the *Guardian* point as proof against the Pope's authority. Now there is a fatal flaw in this canon, and that is, it was enacted after the Fathers of the Council had been dispersed, and in the absence of the Papal Legates, as also of the representatives of the Emperor. In their complaint the Legates said, addressing the Emperor's representatives, "Yesterday, after you and ourselves had withdrawn, something we are told was transacted which we consider opposed to the canons; we desire it may be read, that all the Fathers may see whether it be just or no."* The Emperor's officials and the bishops present do not deny the allegation of the Legates: what then are we to conclude? Obviously that the canon was passed after the conclusion of the day's business, when both the Legates and the Imperial officers had retired. Imagine a bill passed by Parliament after the conclusion of the orders of the day, when both the Speaker and the leaders of parties and the greater part of the House had dispersed themselves,—would any Englishman maintain that such an Act could become law, and would any judge admit it as part of our code? This canon then (taking no account of the Pope's right of confirming or not the acts of Council) was invalid *ab initio*, and never formed part of the accepted Canon Law; and whatever force it possessed was the result of the Imperial will, and the ambitious designs of the successive bishops of Constantinople, who impiously aspired to the title of œcumenical bishop, a title which every Pope has

* Labbe's Concil., t. iv. col. 1731.

refused for himself. But I deny that this canon as it stands is any contradiction of Papal claims; it is true that the canon is very loosely drawn up, as could scarcely be otherwise from the manner it was brought forward, and hastily passed by the remaining bishops of Council, who assembled *out of session*, *i. e.* after the session of the day had been concluded, and in the absence of both the Imperial and Papal representatives.

To understand the real technical meaning of the canon in question, we must, as I said in my late work, examine the comments of the Imperial representatives (who were weak enough to accept what had been done in their absence), and the terms of the synodical epistle to the Pope requesting his confirmation of the said canon. The canon provides that the same privileges that attached to the Roman Bishop, as the First Patriarch, be extended to the bishop of Constantinople, which is called "New Rome." The word πρεσβείων is that which is translated "privileges." My Reviewer says the word denotes more than dignity,—this I admit; but the nature of that dignity must be determined by the passage in which this word occurs. The privileges or prerogatives which the Fathers alluded to as having been granted to Old Rome, were such as appertained to the dignity of the Imperial city, not such as belonged to the Chair of S. Peter. This is clear from what the Imperial officers say; viz., "that the Primacy of special honour (τὰ πρωτεῖα καὶ τὴν ἐξαιρέτην τιμήν) should be preserved for the Archbishop of Old Rome, but that the Archbishop of Constantinople ought to enjoy

the same privilege of honour (τῶν αὐτῶν πρεσβείων τῆς τιμῆς), and that he has a right to ordain the metropolitans of the dioceses of Asia, Pontus," &c. There is a very decided distinction between the Primacy of "special honour" and "the privileges of honour" with respect to the rights of ordaining the metropolitans in the Patriarchate. It must be evident to every fair mind that the object of the canon was to confer not the dignity of the Chair of Peter upon Constantinople, but the patriarchal rights of Rome in the second order of precedency. No doubt the words "same privileges of honour" may seem to include both the Papal and the Patriarchal dignities; but if we appeal once more to Imperial authority itself for the interpretation, we shall find, from the language of its representatives, this could not be. Theodosius and Valentinian, A.D. 450, define the dignity of the Primacy of the Roman Bishop to be derived from "the Merit of Peter, Chief of the corona of bishops," and from "the dignity of the city of Rome."* The Primacy of the Roman Bishop consists then, first, as the Supreme Pontiff of the Universal Church, and secondly, as the first Patriarch, who obtained this office on account of the dignity of the Imperial city. And in order to show that the Primacy of the Supreme Pontiff was something more than a mere primacy of precedence, the Emperors Marcian and Valentinian, whose officials were present at this Council, say, in a letter to Pope Leo, "We deem it right in the first instance, to address your Holiness, holding,

* Opera S. Leon., inter Ep. Leon., t. i. Ep. xi. col. 637. Migne.

as you do, the Headship of the Episcopate of the divine Faith." * It is idle then for the *Guardian* to contend that the Primacy of the Pope was that of mere honour, and that the same privileges in respect to the East were conceded by this canon, or by the Emperors, as were recognized as belonging to the Holy See.

The synodical epistle to Pope S. Leo requesting his confirmation of this canon completely sets at rest this point. Reciting what had been done, they ask the Pope "to extend his wonted (or customary) care to the Church of Constantinople." † Will my Reviewer deny that this is not a full admission on the part of the very bishops who framed the canon in question, of the superiority of the Roman Pontiff, not in honour only but in authority? And further, they request him to continue, as aforetime, "to enlighten it [that is the Church of Constantinople] with his apostolic ray," ‡ —that is as Teacher and Pastor. Further on they ask the Pope, saying, "honour . . . our judgment with your Decree, that as we have been united to OUR HEAD [*i. e.* the Pope] in agreeing upon that which is

* Opera S. Leon., inter Ep. Leon., t. i. Ep. lxxiii. col. 899. Migne.

Valentinian III., in his letter to Theodosius in reference to the position of the Pope, says, "We are bound by the tradition of our ancestors, with all devotion, in our time to defend and maintain inviolate, both the dignity of particular (or peculiar) reverence to the Apostle Peter, seeing that the most blessed Bishop of Rome, to whom antiquity has attributed the Princedom of the Priesthood over all, may have both place and liberty to judge concerning the Faith and the priests," *i. e.* Bishops.—Opera S. Leon., inter Ep. Leon., t. i. Ep. lv. col. 860

† Labbe's Concil., t. iv. col. 1779. ‡ *Ib.*

right, so THE HEAD [*i.e.* the Pope] may confirm the becoming act of the children" * (*i. e.* the Bishops). Can there be a more exhaustive commentary on this 28th Canon than the above? How is it possible then, in the face of the explanation of the Imperial officers, the Emperors themselves, and the synodical letter of the bishops to the Pope, to fix such an interpretation on the said 28th Canon as my Reviewer and Anglicans in general endeavour forcibly to do? So far then from this incident of the Council of Chalcedon contradicting the claims of the Pope to Supremacy over the whole Church, it admits it as fully as it is possible to do.

3. I propose now to show that "the voice" of this Council and that of Ephesus, "accepted throughout Christendom as œcumenical," positively admit and assert the Papal Supremacy as of divine right.

There are two authorities in these Œcumenical Councils which give testimony on this subject,—(1) the Legates of the Pope by their direct claims asserted on behalf of their august master, and by their assumption of superiority; and (2) the Fathers and the representatives of the Emperor, by their explicit or implicit assent. When claims of prerogative are put forth and exercised in an assembly of grave and learned men, if they are founded upon law or usage, they are generally received either *sub silentio*, as being a matter of course; or they express their implicit assent, by a simple approving allusion to them in their

* Labbe's Concil., t. iv. col. 1779.

speeches; or by their conduct when acting in obedience to the authority assuming to direct them. But if such claims are novel, resting upon no real foundation, they are generally opposed and rejected. The authority which the Pope exercises is professedly based on that of S. Peter, which consists of his being "the Rock," "the Foundation," and "Head of all the Faith," and Ruler and Governor of the Catholic Church. Do these Councils endorse this position as that of the Apostle Peter, the Prince of the Apostles? The Œcumenical Councils of Ephesus and Chalcedon most certainly do accept this position for S. Peter. The Legates, in pronouncing sentence upon Dioscorus, the Patriarch of the Apostolic See of Alexandria, assert before the whole Council, and in their midst, that S. Peter "is the Rock and Foundation of the Catholic Church and of the orthodox Faith," * and in the Council of Ephesus, they say, "Your blessedness is not ignorant that the blessed Peter the Apostle was the Head of all the Faith, as also of the Apostles;" and again, "No one doubts but that Peter, the Exarch and Head of the Apostles, Pillar of the Faith, and Foundation of the Catholic Church, received from our Lord Jesus Christ the Keys of His Kingdom, and power to bind and loose sins," &c.† Here we have a definite position asserted by the Legates in these two Œcumenical Councils, which can have only one meaning; viz., that in S. Peter was vested the Supreme Jurisdiction over the Church

* Labbe's Concil., t. iv. col. 1306.

† *Ib.* t. iii. col. 1154.

and the hierarchy, as the Teacher and the Judge of Faith. Not a word of protest is heard against those claims, which, if not true, were most arrogant, and no punishment could have been too severe to mark the gravity of the error. The Fathers were always severe on heretics, and they were quick in discerning error, and extremely impatient for its extirpation. Is it to be believed, if what the Legates had asserted was false, that they would have been silent? It is impossible this could be, and their not protesting against the language of the Legates is a proof of acquiescence.

Now the Pope claims to be what S. Peter was in the government of the Church. Do these Councils endorse this claim? The Legate who addressed the Council of Ephesus thus continues his speech, which I quoted above: ". . . . Peter . . . . received from our Lord Jesus Christ the Keys of His Kingdom, and power to bind and loose sins, and that even to the present time he [Peter] lives, and exercises these judicial powers in his Successors, our holy Pope Bishop Celestine [of Rome], who at this time holds his [Peter's] Place, has sent us to represent him in this holy Council, which our most Christian Emperors have convened in order to preserve intact the Catholic Faith which has descended to them from their ancestors."* We have here a distinct declaration that the Pope occupied the place of S. Peter in the hierarchy, that is, "as Exarch," "Head," "Pillar of the Faith," "Foundation of the Catholic Church," the exclusive bearer

* Labbe's Concil., t. iii. coll. 1154, 1155.

of the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven, and as possessing, in plenitude of authority and jurisdiction, all those high prerogatives and powers—judicial and administrative—which were comprehended under the Apostolic Keys which S. Peter alone received. He who possesses the keys of the city is the master of the city. Such Jesus did make S. Peter when He delivered to him the Keys; such is each successive Pope who "holds his [Peter's] Place," in whom S. Peter "lives and exercises his judicial powers." This is evidently the purport of the speech of the Legate. Is there heard a murmur of dissent from the 600 Fathers assembled at Chalcedon? Do we hear of any one bishop rising to protest against these unheard-of claims? Do even the heretics Nestorius and Dioscorus protest? No, no one dissents. What, then, is the obvious inference? Clearly that nothing extraordinary had been said, no new claims put forth, no novel declaration of authority and power made.

Do not suppose that the Fathers would have acquiesced in these claims if they had been false and fraudulent. There have been not a few who have opposed the Supreme Pontiff when claiming rights deemed to be novel; as for example, what are called minor causes, that is, not causes of Faith or of grave scandal. The conduct of the Asiatic bishops in the paschal question, of the Council of Carthage under S. Cyprian, and that of another council in the same city in the matter of the Apiarian scandal, shows clearly enough the readiness of bishops to oppose the Pope, if they thought he had exceeded his rights as the undoubted Chief of the Catholic

Church. The fact of no protest being heard against the language of the Legates is proof of acquiescence on their part.

The Fathers, however, both of the Council of Ephesus and Chalcedon, do not merely accept the Papal Supremacy as derived from S. Peter *implicitly*, but *explicitly* by word and action. The condemnation of Nestorius and Dioscorus, Patriarchs of Constantinople and Alexandria, by the Pope alone, or by his Legates acting on his behalf, demonstrates the fact of the Papal Supremacy. "Nestorius himself . . . . refused to obey the citation and to receive the bishops who were sent to him on our part . . . . and having convicted him . . . . of holding and teaching impious doctrine, being compelled [so to do] by the necessity of the canons, and by the Letters of our most holy Father and colleague Celestine, Bishop of the Roman Church."* Here is a recognition of the Papal authority sufficient to compel the Fathers, independently of the Canons, to proceed to judgment. Firmus, bishop of Cappadocia, endorses the effect of this judgment when he says in the Council, "The holy Apostolic See of Celestine has decided this affair, and has pronounced sentence on it before in the Letter addressed to Cyril of Alexandria. . . . In accordance with which sentence, and in furtherance thereof, we have pronounced a canonical judgment against Nestorius";† and S. Cyril of Alexandria, President of the Council, adds: "Since, then, we, beloved of God, have executed the sentence of the

* Labbe's Concil., t. iii. col. 1078. † *Ib.* col. 1147.

most holy Bishop Celestine, and of the holy Synod congregated in the metropolitan city of Ephesus, against the heretic Nestorius, let the acts of what passed yesterday and to-day be joined to the preceding, that they may signify their consent by subscription."* Will the Reviewer in the *Guardian* deny that these proceedings of the Fathers of Ephesus are not a decided recognition of the Supreme authority of the Pope as the Head and Judge of Faith, as "the Pillar of the Faith," and Supreme dispenser of the jurisdiction of the Keys; and that the Fathers accepted by their acts, the fact that the judgment pronounced upon Nestorius was the judgment of S. Peter himself, who exercised in this case "his judicial powers in his Successor" Bishop Celestine, "who at that time held his place"?

Let us now consider the case of Dioscorus. Dioscorus was the Patriarch of the Second Apostolic See—a see renowned for having had so great a Father as S. Athanasius, the defender of the Faith against the Arians. Dioscorus had become involved in the Eutychian heresy, and had committed three offences against the Dignity and Prerogative of the Holy See: these were (1) having held a plenary council without the sanction of the Pope; (2) exercising the office of judging in causes of faith; and (3) presuming to excommunicate the Pope himself. The Legates of the Pope, S. Leo, in their address to the officials of the Emperor, and in the presence of the 600 Fathers

* *Ib.* col. 1158.

gathered in the Œcumenical Council of Chalcedon, thus complained of the conduct of Dioscorus: "We have orders from the blessed Bishop of Rome, who is the Head of all the Churches, that Dioscorus should not sit in the Council; therefore, so please your greatness, let him go down, or we must depart"; to which the Imperial officers ask, "What is the specific charge against the most reverend Dioscorus?" The Legates replied: ". . . . He [Dioscorus] presumed to exercise the office of Judge, which does not belong to him, and to hold a council without the authority of the Holy See, a thing which is never lawful, and never can become lawful." It would seem that the Imperial officers somewhat demurred, upon which the Legates said, "We cannot act contrary to the orders of our most blessed Father, or to the canons of the Church and the institutions of the Fathers."*

My Reviewer would probably point to this incident, as proof of the unwillingness of the Imperial officers to accede to the demand of the Pope, as showing that they did not altogether accept the principles of Prerogative laid down by the Legates; and it is probable that he might assert, by way of rejoinder, that they acquiesced in order to prevent the dispersion of the Council before completing their work. But unfortunately for the *Guardian*, these Imperial officers admitted to the full the Papal Prerogative of jurisdiction over all patriarchs, metropolitans, and bishops. This is evident (1) from the fact that in obedience to

* Labbe's Concil., t. iv. coll. 863–866.

the demand of the Pope, Dioscorus was ordered to vacate his seat, and (2) that the final sentence of deposition was pronounced by the Legates, in the name of S. Peter and the Pope, without raising any protest whatever, either from those officers or the assembled bishops, all of whom, except the Legates, were Orientals. The following is the form of the sentence:—"The outrage committed against the canons by Dioscorus, late Bishop of Alexandria, has been plainly proved by the evidence adduced both in the former session and in this. He received to his communion Eutyches, who was condemned by his own bishop. He persisted in maintaining that what he did at Ephesus was well done, though he ought to mourn for it, and ask pardon, as the others have done. He would not permit the Letter of Pope Leo to Flavianus, of sacred memory, to be read; he even excommunicated the most blessed and holy Archbishop Leo of great Rome. . . . . Wherefore, the most holy Archbishop of Rome, Leo, by us and by this present Council, thrice blessed, and with the Apostle S. Peter, who is the Rock and Foundation of the Catholic Church and of the orthodox Faith, deprives him of the episcopal dignity and every sacerdotal ministry. The Council, therefore, will decree concerning him in conformity with the canons."* What, then, was the attitude of the Pope in this Council as represented by his Legates? Was it that of an ordinary bishop, of no greater account than any other bishop? Or that of a mere metropolitan of the same rank as any other

* *Ib.* coll. 1303–1306.

metropolitan? Or that of a great Patriarch, first, perhaps, in order and in precedence, but not greater in grade or power than the patriarchs of the great Oriental Sees? The whole form of this sentence certifies to the contrary. The Pope's attitude, rightly or wrongly, is that of a Master, a Sovereign, and a Supreme Judge, passing sentence, and commanding the Council to decree accordingly, in conformity with the canons. We see here the practical illustration of that which was asserted on behalf of the Pope in the Œcumenical Council of Ephesus:—"Peter the Exarch and Head of the Apostles, Pillar of the Faith and Foundation of the Catholic Church, received from our Lord Jesus Christ the Keys of His Kingdom and power to bind and loose sins, and that even to *the present time* he lives and exercises his judicial powers in his Successors. Our holy Pope Celestine [*then*, and our holy Pope Leo, *now*] at this time holds his Place." As Nestorius, the Patriarch of the second ecclesiastical See, was judged by the then Pope, so Dioscorus, the Patriarch of the second *Apostolic* Throne, was also judged by the great S. Leo, the Council being commanded, as a matter of course, to accept the sentence and decree accordingly. No remonstrance is heard from the Imperial officers, no protest issues forth from any Father of the Council, no loud anathema fulminated against the Pope, for usurping an office which was not his, for assuming superiority over the Council, behaving towards it, as a monarch does, according to form, to his Parliament, and for trampling (as Anglicans

say) upon the prerogatives, the privileges, and the judicial powers of the assembled Prelates, some 600 in number and almost all Easterns, ever jealous of their rights, either individually or as a body. It is inconceivable that they would have been silent if the Pope had claimed and exercised functions which were not his by right, and which could not have been otherwise than schismatical, heretical, sacrilegious, and blasphemous. Is it true then, as the Reviewer in the *Guardian* alleges, that Œcumenical Councils are an authority higher than the Pope, and that the Papal Supremacy has been contradicted by "the voice of two great gatherings, the Council of Constantinople and the Council of Chalcedon"? Can any other answer be given than, No? If any Council ever admitted the Papal Supremacy, most assuredly it was the Œcumenical Council of Chalcedon, and I will add, also that of Ephesus.

Let us now ascertain whether the Council of Chalcedon gives us any direct evidence in favour of the high Monarchical and Papal Prerogatives of the Pope. We must not lose sight of the assertions, of the Papal Legates on behalf of the Prerogatives of the Pope, because, if they were founded on truth, we should most probably find among the acts of these Œcumenical Councils some allusions to them by the assembled Prelates, either in their arguments on the case before them, or by way of acclamation, or in a more formal manner in their acts or decrees. And then again, on the other hand, if not founded upon truth, we should naturally expect some demand for explanations, or at least abstinence from any

language that would admit the canonicity of the Papal claims. In our further investigation of the conduct of the Fathers, let us also keep steadily in view the language and attitude of the Legates in the two Œcumenical Councils of Ephesus and Chalcedon.

After reading to the Council of Chalcedon the celebrated tome of S. Leo the Great, all the Fathers cried out, "Peter has thus spoken by Leo."* What is the meaning of the expression, "Peter has *thus* spoken by Leo"? The Œcumenical Council of Ephesus explains it as we have already seen, that S. Peter, "even to the *present time*, lives and exercises these judicial powers in his Successors," the Pope for the time being filling his place—*i. e.* his lineal descendant in the spiritual and Apostolic order—in whom he lives, by whom he speaks, and by whom he judges all causes of faith, and by whose authority he punishes all those who malign the Faith. As the King never dies, so Peter never dies, but lives and reigns, and exercises his judicial functions in his Successors to his Chair and Dignity. Peter spoke by Leo, that is, S. Leo decided the controversy, and defined what was to be taught and believed by a document which was promulgated by him, not from himself personally as a learned man and doctor, but *ex cathedra*, that is, by the authority of the Chair of Peter; and thus the document was infallible in teaching, inasmuch as it was the judgment of Peter himself.

That this was the meaning of the Fathers of the

* Labbe's Concil., t. iv. col. 1235.

Council of Chalcedon is manifest from their synodical letter to the Pope. They say, "Thou [Leo] being the constituted Interpreter to all men of the voice of the blessed Peter." * What do these words import? Do they not mean that the Pope is the Supreme Judge of Faith? For he who is the "*constituted* Interpreter" must be the supreme Judge of the cause or thing he is commissioned to interpret; more than this, that which he interprets or judges must, from the very nature of the case, be irreformable, otherwise he could not be the "*constituted* or the *ordained* Interpreter." Doubtless there are appeals from a constituted judge to higher judges, but who is superior to the Pope? Is it an Œcumenical Council? This cannot be, because one of those Councils recognized its obligation to obey the "Letters" of the Pope for the deposition of Nestorius, as I have already shown, and another Council submitted to the deposition of Dioscorus from his seat by the command of the Pope; and it also, by the single fiat of the Pontiff, admitted Theodoret to his seat in the Council, the Imperial officers in the presence of the Council saying, "Let the most reverend Bishop Theodoret enter, that he may take part in the Council, since the most holy Archbishop Leo has restored him to the episcopal office, and the most pious Emperor has ordered that he should assist at the Council." † And they also accepted the principle laid down, that no council can be held without the authority of the Holy See; and further

* *Ib.* col. 1779. † *Ib.* coll. 873, 874.

they admitted the force of the Papal sentence, depriving Dioscorus of his episcopal and sacerdotal dignity; and by their obeying the command of the Pope to "decree concerning him in conformity with the canons." The Pope then, as the Supreme Judge, has no superior, except, indeed, our Lord Himself, whose Vicar he is; all bishops individually and collectively, whether each in his own synod or the whole in œcumenical council, are subject to him as their Lord and Father, as their Chief and Supreme Pastor; in a word, as the "constituted," that is the appointed and ordained, "Interpreter to all men of the voice of the blessed Peter." In these few words are unfolded two master-truths respecting the office of the Supreme Pontiff: (1) that he is Peter for the time being, holding from him the office of "the Exarch and Head," of the "Pillar of the Faith," of the "Rock and Foundation of the Catholic Church," and of the Supreme Judge, as is signified by the gift to him of the Keys; and (2) that he being Peter in succession, in whom the original Peter "lives and exercises these judicial powers," is infallible when judging by "the voice of Peter," that is, when he teaches or judges *ex cathedra;* for if he be the "constituted Interpreter," and if Peter really judges in and by him, his Successor, then it is impossible for his *ex-cathedra* decrees to be otherwise than irreformable and infallible. These two Councils then teach (1) explicitly that the Pope "is the constituted Interpreter to all men of the voice of the Blessed Peter," and (2) implicitly,

that he is infallible when exercising that office *ex cathedra*.

Two other assertions of the Fathers in this synodical letter confirm this position of the Pope. First, they recognize their own relations to the Pope and his to them; for they tell him that he "presided over them as the Head over the members." * The members in general of a body are never regarded as equal in dignity or in power to the head. The head is to the body the seat of government and of the will; without it the members can do nothing. It is likewise the centre of the directing power, for until it has decreed its purpose, the members are unable to take any action. Its will too is absolute and irreformable, for every member must obey that head instantly and without a dissentient voice. Such are the functions of the head to the human body; and such are the functions of the Head over the members of the Catholic Church; that is, as this Council declares of the Pope over the bishops. And this relationship, in the second place, is thus explained by these Fathers in the paragraph concerning the rebellious conduct of Dioscorus: ". . . over and above these offences, extending his [Dioscorus] madness against him [Leo], to whom the custody of the Vineyard is committed by the Saviour, that is against your holy apostleship, meditating excommunication against you, who hasten to unite the body of the Church." † Here we have a distinct recognition of the Pope as the

* Labbe's Concil., t. iv. col. 1775. † *Ib.*

Custodian, the Guardian of the one Vineyard, that is the Holy Catholic Church; in a word, as the Supreme Shepherd or Pastor of the one entire fold, which office, they add, was committed to him, not by man, not by the Emperor, not by the bishops of the Church, not by any œcumenical council, not by the common law of the Church, but by Jesus Christ the Saviour. We have then an explicit pronouncement by the Fathers of the Œcumenical Council of Chalcedon, that the Papacy is an institution of divine foundation, that the Pope exercises his sublime office, not by the authority of canons (though canons may have defined it), but by the grace of God, *i. e.* by the direct appointment of Jesus Christ. This single passage gives us the key to a right understanding of the conduct and language of the Fathers in the presence of the Papal legates.

We understand now what the Council of Ephesus meant when it said it was compelled to proceed to judgment "by the necessity of the canons, and by the Letters of our most holy Father and Colleague, Bishop of the Roman Church;" what Firmus implied when he said that "the holy Apostolic See had decided this and had pronounced sentence" on Nestorius; what S. Cyril understood when he said that the Fathers "had executed the sentence of the most holy Bishop Celestine." And further we can now comprehend the attitude of the Legates in these Œcumenical Councils, and their assertions that S. Peter "was the Rock and Foundation of the Catholic Church," "the Head of all the Faith," the "Pillar of the

Faith," the one who received from Christ the power of the Keys in their fulness; and that he "lived and exercised his judicial powers in his Successors," the Pope for the time being "holding his place." We see now by what authority the Pope, by his single will, deposed and restored bishops and pronounced sentence upon heretical prelates even of the chief sees. It was because the whole Catholic Church in œcumenical council believed in the Supreme authority of the Holy See, acknowledging by their voices and by letter that the Pope was the "constituted Interpreter to all men of the voice of the blessed Peter," who lives in him (the Pope) and by him as his organ exercises his judicial powers, deposing one bishop and reinstating another, and this because—as admitted by the Council—of his being the Head, the bishops being related to him, as the members of a body are to its head, to whom, they assert in language clear and definite, "the custody of the Vineyard had been committed," not by canons, not by custom, but "by the Saviour."

And what then must we think of the Reviewer in the *Guardian*, who has had the temerity to tell his readers, and thereby mislead them, that "the testimony on behalf of the Papal Supremacy has been contradicted by a higher authority than that of any one man however eminent, namely by the voice of two great gatherings accepted throughout Christendom as œcumenical, the Council of Constantinople and the Council of Chalcedon"? Charity would dispose one to believe he was ignorant of all the incidents, facts, and

circumstances I have so largely entered into; but he cannot plead this, for I stated them all in the very work he pretended to criticise; but, like all those out of the pale of the true Church, he has ignored the direct testimony of the Councils, especially those which are œcumenical, in favour of the Papal dignity and authority. He has evaded also the witness the Emperors themselves have borne on behalf of that lofty position which S. Peter and his Successors, the Supreme Pontiffs, have in every age occupied, and that too with the full recognition and assent of the Catholic Church.

§ 2.

S. Chrysostom.

Surprise has been expressed that such great Fathers as SS. Chrysostom, Augustine, and others should have written so little concerning the Supremacy of the Pope. Why so? When a position is admitted by all, it is not customary to dilate upon it, unless some circumstances arise to compel allusion to it. When men write books on a variety of subjects, do they usually introduce paragraphs concerning the monarchy or the form of government under which they live? Even in the courts of law and in parliament itself, officials, judges, and members seldom lay down principles of law concerning the regale, or speak about it, unless something occurs which brings the subject prominently before the court or the parliament. Everybody knows that the Queen reigns, and that her pre-

decessors have reigned, though it would be difficult to collect a catena of authorities to prove it to the satisfaction of Anglican minds. The Pope reigns and rules over the Universal Empire-Church, as his Predecessors have done time out of mind; and who except heretics have ever disputed it? When a position of authority is as a rule admitted and submitted to, it is not to be supposed that the Fathers in their writings would frequently allude to it without some reason or necessity.

In the ante-Nicene period of the Church's history, we do not find many details respecting some of the great doctrines of the Church. It would be difficult to draw up a catena of Fathers in that age to prove conclusively the doctrine of the consubstantiality of the eternal Son, or that of the Real Presence, and other doctrines. The truth is these verities were assumed and accepted by all, without the necessity of adducing positive proofs. It was not till the doctrine of the Divinity of our Lord, the reality of his Manhood, the two Natures in one Person, and of the two Wills and Operations were questioned, that the Fathers became more particular in their teaching and more exact in their terminology. So it was with the doctrine concerning the hierarchy of the Church. In the ante-Nicene age only two Fathers, I think, enter into any details respecting the dignity and office of the bishop of (as we now describe it) a diocese, viz., S. Ignatius and S. Cyprian, and I doubt whether much would be found subsequently; and for this manifest reason, that the authority of the bishop

was assumed and accepted by all as a matter of course. And in like manner with respect to S. Peter and his Successors the Popes, their position respectively was admitted, even by heretics, who, as history tells us, appealed to them for redress against their bishops, or the provincial synod that condemned them.

S. Ignatius, S. Irenæus, Tertullian, Origen, and S. Cyprian recognize, as I have proved in my late work, the place of S. Peter in the Apostolic hierarchy, and that of his Successors, the Popes. They enter into no details, but they assume the fact, and that because it was undisputed. They, you will remember, taught that the Church of Rome presided not merely over the Romans but over the entire Church, "over the love," * which Döllinger admits meant that she was "the directress of the testament of love, that is of all Christianity," † and that, too, "in the name of the Father and in the name of the Son;" that by reason of her foundation and of the plenitude of the tradition deposited therein under the custody of this Church, she possessed "a more powerful Principality;" ‡ that she by reason of the presence of the "Chair of Peter," was regarded as the Principal or Ruling Church, "and the Source of the priesthood." § Such was the general testimony of the ante-Nicene Church, not very much, perhaps, but yet more definite and more precise than can be

* Pat. Apost., t. ii. S. Ignat. Ep. ad Rom. Procem.

† Döllinger's Hist. of the Ch., tr. Cox, vol. i. p. 255. Lond. 1840.

‡ S. Iren. adv. Hæres., l. iii. c. 3, n. 2.

§ S. Cyp., Ep. lv. ad Cornel., p. 86.

found for any of the great doctrines of the Catholic Faith. And this testimony is much strengthened by the circumstance of the visit of S. Polycarp to Rome, the appeals of heretics and others, the mad exclamation of Tertullian when, after lapsing into heresy, he ridiculed the Pope's titles of "Supreme Pontiff," "Interpreter of God,"* &c., which titles would never have occurred to him if they had not been in common use in his day: and lastly, the setting in motion of the Supreme jurisdiction of the Holy See against Marcianus, the Primate of Gaul, by S. Cyprian himself.†

It is true that on certain matters of discipline the Pope was sometimes opposed by bishops, but there is no instance of any ante-Nicene Father rejecting the Papal authority in a matter of Faith. S. Cyprian opposed him on a question which he regarded as discipline, but he admitted his Supreme jurisdiction over the entire Church, and, as I have just said, set it in motion against a bishop and a primate in a far-distant land, which did not (so some say) belong to the Roman province or patriarchate. These incidents, as they stand, are strong proofs of the fact of the Supremacy, but there are no details given us; and for this manifest reason, that it was an institution assumed to be existing, just the same as the monarchy of this kingdom is assumed by every writer of English history, and by every lawyer in his treatises on the principles of law. And so again, both in the writings and in

* Opera Tertull., t. ii. de Pudicit., n. i. x.

† S. Cyp., Ep. lxvii. ad Steph., pp. 115–117.

the conciliar acts and decrees of the post-Nicene Fathers; and likewise in the letters of the Catholic Emperors. We have plenty of incidents of the exercise of Papal rule, and of allusions to a Papal power existing and controlling the whole Church, but, as I have observed, an absence of details in the doctrine itself of the Papal Supremacy.

And now with regard to individual Fathers like S. Chrysostom and others, my Reviewer seems to think it most extraordinary that if the Papal Supremacy was really a fact in their day, so little concerning it should be found in their works. This is a fallacious argument and very misleading. Why should S. Chrysostom or any other Father assert the presence of an institution professedly existing in their day, unchallenged by any one, and in point of fact admitted by all, and accepted by all? Do you doubt this? Then I refer you to the previous section, and you will see that "the voice of at least two great gatherings accepted throughout Christendom as œcumenical," the Council of Ephesus and "the Council of Chalcedon," have fully admitted and sanctioned it.

1. It is time now we should turn our attention to the strictures on the evidence of S. Chrysostom. The complaint of the *Guardian* is, that "when we look for evidence to show that S. Chrysostom seriously believed that the Bishops of Rome from all time had inherited from S. Peter the position of an *Episcopus Episcoporum*, we must remark, firstly, (*a*) that out of his voluminous writings our author is unable to cite more than half a page which even *appears* to hint, even apparently, at such a con-

clusion, and that this small amount will not bear the slightest cross-examination; secondly, (*b*) that Mr. Lindsay, *more suo*, ignores the whole mass of counter-evidence deducible from the great Archbishop's life and correspondence. Let us look for a moment at each side." * It is necessary at the outset that we should clear the ground of all impediments to a right understanding of each other's position, otherwise we may be fighting in the dark. To follow the *Guardian* in its wild mode of warfare is impossible, unless we agree upon certain canons of criticism, which I propose now to state. A fair critic will admit the following important points respecting the position of S. Chrysostom in this matter: (1) that he was a Catholic bishop; (2) that the doctrine he held was that of all the Catholic bishops of his day, and of his and their Catholic predecessors; (3) that from the very circumstance of the Catholic Church up to his day admitting the fact of the Papal Supremacy, as has been proved *ad nauseam*, and having accepted the same, is of itself a proof that S. Chrysostom also held the doctrine; and lastly, that if there should be found any passage in his writings of doubtful signification, it must be interpreted according to the *consensus patrum* of the Catholic Church.

The *Guardian* maintains that Flavian, Patriarch of Antioch, was supported by S. Chrysostom at the very time he was out of the communion of the Holy See; † therefore it is implied that S. Chry-

* The *Guardian*, Sept. 7, 1870. † *Ib.*

sostom did not hold the doctrine of the Papal Supremacy. Can this assertion be substantiated? Let us look at the facts as stated by the ecclesiastical historians of the period.

There were two bishops ruling in the Church of Antioch at the same time; viz., Meletius and Paulinus. I showed, in a former chapter,* how impossible it was to ascertain who of these two was the canonical bishop, and that consequently it was agreed that both should jointly hold the See, but on the condition that the survivor should be accepted as the sole bishop. Meletius died first, and Paulinus by right became the true bishop of the diocese and patriarchate. The clergy of the Church of Antioch, however, did not agree to accept Paulinus,† as they were bound to do by this arrangement, and they proceeded to elect Flavian in the room of Meletius.‡ Soon afterwards Paulinus departed this life, and Evagrius was chosen in his place.§ Evagrius, however, did not long survive his election,‖ and Flavian became sole bishop *de facto* if not at first *de jure*.

Now what was the conduct of S. Chrysostom in these difficult times? Did he fraternize with Flavian when he was elected? Did he support him in his schism? Did he defy the Roman Pontiff's authority, which had rejected the election of Flavian? Nothing of the sort. "After the

* Vide sup., pp. 16–24. † Theod. H. E., l. v. c. 23.

‡ Sozom. H. E., l. vii. c. 11.

§ Sozom. H. E., l. vii. c. 15; Soc. H. E., l. v. c. 15; Theod. H. E., l. v. c. 23.

‖ Soc. H. E., l. v. c. 15; Soz. H. E., l. vii. c. 15.

death of Meletius at Constantinople," says Socrates, whither he had gone on account of the ordination of Gregory of Nazianzun, "John [Chrysostom] withdrew from the Meletians, without entering into communion with Paulinus, and spent three years in retirement. When Paulinus was dead, he was ordained priest by Evagrius, the successor of Paulinus. Such is the brief outline of John's [Chrysostom] career previous to his call to the episcopate."* It would seem, from this statement, that S. Chrysostom did not approve of the election of Flavian to the See of Antioch, for immediately on hearing of the death of Paulinus, the lawful bishop, he returned to Antioch and recognized Evagrius, his successor, as his proper bishop, from whose hands he received the order of priesthood:† it cannot be supposed S. Chrysostom would have allowed himself to be ordained by Evagrius if he had believed Flavian to have been at that time the rightful Bishop of Antioch. Evagrius was acknowledged by Rome and the West,‡ and hence S. Chrysostom was in full communion with the Holy See.

The *Guardian*, however, quotes a passage from S. Chrysostom, in which he speaks of Flavian "as our common Father and Teacher,"§ as proving that this Father was in communion with one who was not recognized by the Holy See. But the question is, when did S. Chrysostom make this assertion? Did he make it before or after the death of Eva-

* Soc., l. vi. c. 3. † *Ib.*

‡ Theod. H. E., l. v. c. 23. § The *Guardian*, Sept. 7, 1870

grius? That he did not long survive Paulinus is certain, and Paulinus is said to have died in 389. The *Guardian* evidently supposes that the year when S. Chrysostom made this assertion, viz., that Flavian was "our common Father and Teacher," was previous to the death of Paulinus and Evagrius; and he has some authority for this belief if the editorial advertisement prefixed to the Homily entitled "In Inscriptionem altaris" is correct in its chronological remarks. But it it is well known that dates in those early days cannot be entirely relied upon. The precise year when Flavian was reconciled with the Holy See cannot be determined, because the contemporary historians differ on this point.

According to Theodoret, this occurred in A.D. 391, in which year a commission headed by Acacius, proceeded to Rome, and by their representations satisfied the mind of the Pope; and thus they (the Commission) "terminated the long-continued hostility which had lasted seventeen years, and restored peace to the Church";* and on the other hand Sozomen places the date of this occurrence in the year A.D. 398,† so that it is impossible for the *Guardian* to make any point against the orthodoxy of S. Chrysostom with respect to the Supremacy; for the alleged fact that he had uttered these words before the death of Paulinus and Evagrius, and before Flavian's reconciliation with Rome, cannot be proved. In a case like this, where there is a difference about dates, the general account, as given by the his-

* Theod. H. E., l. v. c. 23. † Soz. H. E., l. viii. c. 3.

torians, must be taken as settling the question raised by the *Guardian*. It is a fact that S. Chrysostom did not recognize Flavian as bishop, as long as Paulinus and Evagrius lived, and there is very little doubt that soon afterwards Flavian was acknowledged Bishop of Antioch by the Holy See and the West.

The objection the *Guardian* has raised is in reality very absurd, and really does not touch the main point at issue.

2. The *Guardian* seems to think that the language of S. Chrysostom concerning Flavian as successor of S. Peter at Antioch is a point against the Supremacy. He describes Flavian "as a Peter inheriting both Peter's virtue and Peter's chair"; but how this play on the name "Peter" helps the case against Rome is difficult to discern. Every Catholic bishop, whether his name be Peter or not, is a "Peter," and every episcopal chair being in union with the Chair of Peter at Rome, is "Peter's chair;" just the same as the throne of the Lord-lieutenant of Ireland, or of the Viceroy of India, is the Queen's throne. True, S. Peter once sat in the chair of Antioch and ruled that Church as well as the Catholic Church; but S. Chrysostom tells us that "we did not retain him, but surrendered him to royal Rome." Nor does the continuation of the passage help the case of the *Guardian;* viz., "or rather, we held him to the end; for we do not indeed retain the body of Peter, but we retain the faith of Peter, as Peter; retaining the faith of Peter we have Peter himself."* Of course

* The *Guardian*, Sept. 7, 1870.

every see being subject to the See of Peter, retains, or rather inherits, his faith, and even his power, for "he lives and reigns in his Successors" the Roman Pontiffs, as we are told by the Council of Ephesus; and consequently every bishop who is united with the Successor of Peter possesses his "power." So far then from this language of S. Chrysostom testifying against the Papal Supremacy, it witnesses in its behalf, for it establishes the fact of the faith of Peter being that which all must accept; and it also points to the truth that S. Peter was the source and foundation of the Catholic Church. What is this but the Papal Supremacy in its original form, as wielded by the first Supreme Pontiff? This point will be presently discussed when we consider S. Chrysostom's doctrine of S. Peter's place in the Catholic Church.

3. The next point of the Reviewer in the *Guardian* is his criticism on the argument drawn from the Saint's correspondence with the Pope. He thus writes: "Unquestionably the great Patriarch of Constantinople [Chrysostom] *did* regard the Bishop of Rome as a brother Patriarch, one of even higher rank than himself, and did, in his distresses, invite the Roman Church to display 'that vigour and zeal which became it, so as to repress that great wickedness which had invaded the Churches.' But how any one can see in Chrysostom's two letters to Innocent I. anything more than this, any approximation even to an appeal, as to a sovereign power, entirely surpasses our comprehension."* The following

* The *Guardian*, Sept. 7, 1870.

admissions are, however, noteworthy: (1) That the rank of the Pope was "unquestionably" "higher" than that of the Patriarch of Constantinople; (2) that the Roman Pontiff was accustomed to exercise universal authority with "vigour and zeal"; (3) that the object of such "vigour and zeal" was not merely by way of advice and admonition, but by the exercise of *coercive* jurisdiction, "so as to repress that great wickedness which had invaded the Churches."

In these admissions, especially the last one, the Reviewer in the *Guardian* admits the whole principle of the Papal Supremacy; for how could the Pope "*repress* that great wickedness which had invaded the Churches" beyond his patriarchate, unless he possessed authority and power so to do? The *Guardian* admits the authority of the Pope in all Churches outside his immediate patriarchate, *i.e.* in the Universal Church, by his own sole Prerogative and power, "to repress" all disorders that may occur in any part of the Catholic Church. I do not know what greater admission could be made in favour of the Papal Supremacy than this, and yet the *Guardian* says he cannot see in it "any approximation even to an appeal as to a sovereign power." This is an apt illustration of the extraordinary mental blindness in men out of the Catholic Church; for though the very truth shines refulgent before them, and though they actually in words admit the doctrine, yet they cannot comprehend its import, they cannot even grasp the idea which the words they employ actually convey—even when the words allow of no secondary signification.

But let us examine these letters and ascertain whether the admissions of the *Guardian* are really supported by the language of S. Chrysostom's letters to the Pope. That the words "repress that great wickedness which has invaded the Churches" have a *coercive* signification is clear from the following clause, "and that they who have been proved to have acted thus against all law be subjected to the laws of the Church";* that is, obviously, that the Supreme Pontiff may display that vigour and zeal which became him, in order that he might "repress that great wickedness which had invaded the Churches," by subjecting the offenders to the penalty provided by "the laws of the Church";—in other words, that the Pope should exercise his Supreme power with the view of repressing and putting down the parties who had occasioned the scandal complained of. The *admissions* of the *Guardian*, then, are fully supported by S. Chrysostom's epistle to the Pope.

We are told, however, that the letter was written not only to the Pope, but to Venerius, Bishop of Milan, and Chromatius, Bishop of Aquileia. "What a light," exclaims the *Guardian*, "it throws upon the value of Mr. Lindsay's inferences!"† For the sake of argument let this be admitted, and how, I ask, does it help the case on the part of the *Guardian?* The object of S. Chrysostom's appeal to the West was to obtain from *that quarter* of the world justice, by the act of the customary "vigour and zeal" of (let

* Opera S. Chrysost., t. iii. Ep. i. ad Innocent., n. 4.

† The *Guardian*, Sept. 7, 1870.

us say) the Western Bishops, which they were to display, not in words only, not merely by decrees, but by deeds, that is, by "repressing" the wickedness complained of, and by subjecting the defaulters to the penalty provided by "the laws of the Church"; that is to say, S. Chrysostom asked the West to reduce the East to order, and to punish the refractory members of his Church.

A question immediately arises, what authority or jurisdiction did the Western bishops possess to empower them so to act? The Bishops of Milan and Aquileia, and other Italian prelates, were not bishops of any diocese contiguous to the see of Constantinople, or even to the patriarchate; so that, unless they had some special jurisdiction, they were incompetent to act as S. Chrysostom desired. If they were, then the only difference between the *Guardian* and the Catholic Church would be that the Supremacy was vested not in the Pope, but in the Italian episcopate, with or without (if such be possible!) the Pope. So that the Supreme governing power would be not in Rome, but in Italy! Does the *Guardian* wish us to believe that the Supremacy which he admits is vested in the Italian Episcopate, but not in the Holy See? If such be his opinion, he must inform us how it is that the bishops of Italy acquired this supreme authority and jurisdiction. He will not find it in the Bible, nor in Tradition, nor in any canon œcumenical, provincial, or local of the Catholic Church. Whence, then (for that S. Chrysostom recognized a Supremacy somewhere in Italy is as clear as day), is it derived? The argument

of the *Guardian* is simply absurd and irrational; for if the bishops of Italy did possess this Supremacy, they could have obtained it from only one source, viz. the Chair of Peter at Rome, the Bishop of which being also their Patriarch, the whole of them were his *immediate* subjects, and could not perform any synodical act or function concerning the Church either as a whole or in part, according to the general canon law, without his express approval. So even admitting this view of the matter, the Supremacy is in the last resort vested in the Pope himself, who alone is the Supreme and executive Head of his own patriarchate, and its sole Source of jurisdiction; and inasmuch as, according to the *Guardian*, that patriarchate possessed jurisdiction over the whole world, having power to "repress" disorders in any part of the Catholic Church, and of subjecting the evil-doers to penalties, it could only exercise it by the authority of the Supreme Pontiff. View the matter in any way you please, the *Guardian* admits by its argument the Supremacy of the Holy See as the ultimate and final authority.

There is no doubt that the Italian bishops in the days of S. Chrysostom did possess a position somewhat distinct from the bishops of every other province or patriarchate. They formed, in fact, the standing council of the Pope; they were his counsellors and his assistants in the government of the Universal Church. Pope Felix, A.D. 484, thus explains this: "As often as the priests of the Lord are assembled together in Italy for ecclesiastical causes, especially those con-

cerning the Faith, the custom is observed that the Successor of the prelates of the Apostolic See determined all things, in the person of all the priests of the whole of Italy, in accordance with the solicitude of all the Churches which belong to him, who is the Head of all, the Lord saying to blessed Peter, 'Thou art Peter, and upon this Rock I will build my Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.' Following which voice, the 318 Fathers who assembled at Nicæa carried with them the confirmation of things and the authority of the holy Roman Church; both which, even to our age, all successions, by the grace of Christ, observe."* They were related to the Pope, very much as the Privy Council is to the King of England. It advises and assists the sovereign power, and sometimes it is united with its chief in the promulgation of decrees and their enforcement, and this, too, without in the least impairing the dignity, the prerogative, and jurisdiction of the King in the secular order. The same thing may be said, *mutatis mutandis*, of the Pope in the universal ecclesiastical order.

The *Guardian* says, on the authority of Palladius, that this letter of S. Chrysostom "was also written to Venerius, Bishop of Milan, and Chromatius, Bishop of Aquileia." Does he mean that it was addressed to each of them *separately*, and independently of the Pope? If such is his meaning, then he has not a tittle of evidence to support his allegation. It is probable that copies of the letters

* Labbe, S. Concil., t. v. Ep. ad Cler. et Monarch. Orient., p. 248.

in question may have been sent to them; but it was as members of the Pope's council, in order to put them in possession of the facts of the case. In our secular life we are accustomed to address petitions to Parliament asking for certain favours, or to object to some bill before it, or to complain of the conduct of some official; but whoever construed such acts as in the least degree derogatory of the supreme authority and jurisdiction of the Sovereign? In like manner, it was open to S. Chrysostom to address any Western bishop he pleased, without necessarily calling in question the Supremacy of the Pontiff.

Now let us turn to this letter: To whom is it addressed? It is addressed to the *Pope alone*. The following is the superscription: "Innocentio episcopo Romæ, Domino meo Reverendissimo, Pientissimoque, Joannes in Domino salutem"; that is, "John to my most Reverend and Holy Lord Innocent, Bishop of Rome, health in the Lord"; and the epistle ends thus: "Semper vale, et ora pro me, domine reverendissime et sanctissime"; that is, "Farewell always, and pray for me, most reverend and most holy Lord." There is no other copy of this letter, nor any record of any to be found in S. Chrysostom's works, addressed to any other bishop than S. Innocent, Bishop of Rome. Copies of this letter may have been sent to other bishops, but they were only copies, nothing more. In the body of this letter occurs the expression, "my honoured and religious Lords," showing that it was addressed to the Pope in Council; and this view of it is taken by Fleury, who says,

"S. Chrysostom's letter, according to the inscription, is directed only to Pope Innocent; but in the sequel of his discourse, he speaketh, as it were, to several persons, supposing, without doubt, that it would be read in a council, as is usual; and at the conclusion he saith, that he had communicated the same to Venerius, Bishop of Milan, and Chromatius of Aquileia."* The argument of the *Guardian*, then, is pointless, and does not in the least affect the question; for after all, if the Reviewer has any *locus standi* at all, it is not a controversy as to whether there is or is not a living Supreme authority in the Church, but whether the seat of that authority be in the Bishop of Rome or the bishops of Italy: if the latter, well then, as far as my Reviewer in the *Guardian* is concerned, he must submit himself to that episcopate, that is, to the bishops of Italy in Council, that is, again, the Italian

* Fleury, H. E., l. xxi. c. 58. Herbert Tr., vol. iii. p. 74.

There is no doubt that the Italian Episcopate, in the early primitive ages, formed the Council of the Supreme Pontiff, which assisted him in the execution of the duties of his exalted office. As early as A.D. 265 we read of an appeal having been made to the Pagan Emperor Aurelian for the delivery of the episcopal house at Antioch, which Paul of Samosata retained after his deposition from the see in that city, when the Emperor adjudged it should "be given np to those whom the Christian bishops of Italy and Rome should appoint." (Eus. H. E., l. vii. c. 30.)

S. Cyprian probably alluded to this Council when he spoke of the "college of ancient priests and good men," the "Sacerdotal College," the Chair of which he called the "Sacerdotal Chair," its occupant, the Pope, being sometimes styled "Bishop of the most holy Catholic Church," "Priest [Bishop] of God," communion with whom was the same thing "as communion with the Catholic Church," &c.—Opera S. Cyp., Ep. xlvi. lii.

Episcopate under the government and jurisdiction of the Bishop of Rome, their Patriarch; and as it is admitted that they together have the Supremacy over the whole Church, therefore it follows, from the argument of the *Guardian*, that he must acknowledge not only the Supremacy of Italy, but the Supremacy of Rome, the Head and Crown of the Italian Episcopate.

4. The Reviewer in the *Guardian* presents to his readers, as an antidote to the passages which favour the Supremacy, the following, taken from a letter of S. Chrysostom to Venerius, Bishop of Milan, numbered in the Benedictine edition 182:—"All men have known of old your courage, outspokenness, and free utterance on behalf of the truth; but the present occasion has displayed with still greater precision your fraternal feeling, your charity, your piety, your sympathy with us, *your care on behalf of the Churches* (*τὴν κηδεμονίαν τὴν ὑπὲρ τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν*). As the storm at sea especially marks out the pilot, and severe diseases of the bodily frame the best physician, even so do the difficulties of the time show him who zealously cultivates a life of piety and possesses much courage."* The object of the *Guardian* is an attempt to prove, by way of illustration, that forms of expression touching Supremacy, similar to those which were often addressed to the Pope, were likewise, on similar occasions, addressed to other distinguished bishops, and that consequently such expressions amount to nothing more than

* The *Guardian*, Sept. 7, 1870.

mere words of courtesy or deference, an Oriental mode of speaking, which, in point of fact, are not intended to mean what the words seem naturally to convey. The conclusion the Reviewer evidently desired his readers to draw for themselves was, that the Pope was only a bishop, differing from none of the others, except in rank and precedency. When will Anglicans learn that the Catholic Church teaches that the sole distinction between the Pope and his brethren is in jurisdiction; that all the bishops, the Pope included, form one indivisible brotherhood, each one equal to the other, in order and priesthood; that the Pope's Mass is no more effectual than that of the humblest priest; and that in the ordination and consecration of priests and bishops, his hands convey no greater power than those of the bishop of the poorest and most insignificant city in the world. The distinction is solely one of jurisdiction, in the exercise of which the Pope, so far as regards his *ex-cathedra* judgments in matters of Faith and Morals, is infallible. Again, not only are all bishops, inclusive of the Pope, equal in order, but all are equal in the school of theology, and also in the race for the attainment of the highest and most exalted degree of holiness and sanctity.

Such being the case, we should naturally expect that terms expressive of high proficiency, of talent, of power, of administration, of skill in conducting the Church through times of great emergencies, would be addressed to any bishop or priest who, by the weight of his sanctity or learning, or by the force of a powerful mind, should happen to be the leader

of his age, and the master of the "storm," by divine Providence, he may be called upon to control and direct in the interests even of the whole Universal Church. It is open to any bishop, from the highest to the lowest in rank, to fill any one of these temporary offices without in the least degree disparaging the dignity or the Supremacy of the Papacy as a divine institution. As a matter of fact the Holy Ghost has from time to time raised up special instruments fitted for times and circumstances; and these were the master spirits of the day.

In the ante-Nicene age S. Cyprian stands out foremost as the great champion for truth, and also for mercy to the penitent, which the Novatians and others had denied, as opposed to the will of God; and, further, he was the great defender of the Pope against Novatian, the antipope. When the Arian heresy disturbed the Church, it was S. Athanasius who "beat the storm," and destroyed the heresy. Then followed S. Cyril, then the great Pope S. Leo, and then the master mind of S. Augustine; and so on down to the present day. And these were the "pilots" and the "physicians" of the day, which the "storms" of those ages forced to the surface, and who, under the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, vindicated truth from falsehood, and contributed powerfully to the annihilation of the enemies of God and man. But because of those circumstances and events it is gravely maintained that the Pope could not be what he claims to be, the Supreme Head of the Catholic Church, armed with Superior jurisdiction,

else, by his sole power, he would have instantly crushed the enemies of the Church.

Let us test this from the old law. No one can dispute that the chair of Moses was the supreme authority under the law, and that the Jewish Pontiff was superior in jurisdiction to every other priest in the Temple. And yet, notwithstanding this, God raised up at divers periods of Jewish history many who were not High-priests to deliver messages of admonition, of censure, and of judgment against the wicked princes of those early times. Indeed, more than this, God employed some to appoint kings, to change dynasties, to direct the government in times of great emergency, to interfere in political movements; and further, prophets have even rebuked and judged, by God's special command, the High-priests themselves, as in the case of Eli. And in the prophecy of future events—of the incarnation, death, burial, resurrection, and ascension of Jesus Christ, and the foundation and expansion of the Catholic Church—how many who were not High-priests have been privileged with this exalted dignity. Here we observe perfect equality between the High-priest and others in the work of effecting God's will on earth, in the admonitions, censures, and judgments by the mouth sometimes of the High-priest, sometimes of ordinary priests, who were prophets, and at other times by laymen, as the wicked Saul, the holy David, and the beloved Daniel. Terms then expressive of the characteristics of those great masters in Israel might with perfect impunity be addressed to them all, the High-priest included, without in any degree

compromising his position, his dignity, and the prerogatives attached to the chair of Moses, of which he was the occupant.

And so with regard to the Pope. The two cases are analogous, with this difference, that the High-priest and the general priesthood were not precisely equal in the power of order, for some of the priestly functions of the former were not shared in by the ordinary priests; but in the case of the Pope, every priestly or episcopal function is shared equally by the rest of the hierarchy; and this circumstance tells in favour of the position of the Pope; for if terms of excellency and of character, such as prophet, leader, pilot, &c. &c., might be used indifferently to priests and laymen, women included, without compromising the authority of the chair of Moses, *à fortiori*, similar expressions may be addressed to both Popes and bishops, without affecting the Papal position. So far, then, the argument of the *Guardian* against the Papacy is worthless.

If the *Guardian* desired to make a good point against the Papacy, it should have endeavoured to prove that terms exclusively expressive of the Supremacy and Jurisdiction of the Pope had been employed by the Fathers on behalf of any other bishop. For example, S. Ignatius says that the Church of Rome "presides over the love, in the Name of Christ and in the Name of the Father."* Did S. Ignatius or any other bishop ever address such words as these to any other church in the world? S. Irenæus says, "It is a matter of

* Ep. ad Rom., Procem.

necessity that every Church should agree with this [the Roman] Church, because of its pre-eminent authority."* Has any other Church ever been described in such terms as these? S. Cyprian affirmed the Chair of Peter to be the "Sacerdotal Chair," † the Church of Rome the "Ruling Church," the "source of the priesthood," ‡ the "root and womb of the Catholic Church." § Can it be said that any other Church has been similarly described? S. Ambrose and the Council of Aquileia assert that from the Roman Church "flow unto all the rights of venerable communion." ‖ Has any other Church been declared to be the source to the whole world of the "rights of venerable communion"? S. Cyril pronounces that the Roman Pontiff is not merely Patriarch and "Bishop of Rome, but Archbishop of the whole inhabited globe." ¶ Has any other patriarch, archbishop, or primate been so designated? Sozomen tells us that "it is a sacerdotal law, that the things done contrary to the decree of the Bishop of the Romans be regarded as null." ** Has this ever been said with respect to any other bishop? And so I might go on *ad infinitum*, if necessary, but these are sufficient. If the *Guardian* could have produced counter-evidence of the same class to show

* Opera S. Iren., adv. Hæres., l. iii. c. 3, n. 2.

† Opera S. Cyp., Ep. lii. ad Antoni., p. 68.

‡ *Ib.* Ep. lv. ad Cornel., p. 86.

§ *Ib.* Ep. xlviii. ad Cornel., p. 59.

‖ Opera S. Amb., Ep. xi.; Concil. Aquil. Impp. Gratian., &c., n. 4; and Labbe's Concil., t. ii. p. 1185.

¶ Opera S. Cyril. Alex., t. v. p. ii.; Encom. in S. Mariam Deip., p. 384.

** Soz. H. E., l. iii. c. 10. See also Soc. H. E., l. ii. c. 17.

that other bishops and churches had been similarly described, then he would have had a strong point against the Church of Rome and her High Pontiff. This, however, he cannot do. All that he can do is to produce such passages as that quoted from the letter of S. Chrysostom to Venerius, Bishop of Milan, which I shall now show is *nihil ad rem.*

The points in this passage supposed to neutralize S. Chrysostom's evidence for the Papacy, are (1) that Venerius is commended for his "care on behalf of the Churches"; and (2) that, like the pilot which "the storm at sea" brings to the aid of mariners, and the best physician which severe diseases bring into pre-eminence, he (Venerius), by his piety and his courage, overcame the difficulties which at that time overwhelmed the Church. The *Guardian* seems to think that the clause "care on behalf of the Churches," if addressed to the Pope, would be accepted as proof of S. Chrysostom's belief of the Supremacy! This I admit, if it was supported by other passages in the writings of this saint, or in those of other Catholic bishops. It would be a small link in the chain of evidence, nothing more; but standing by itself, this passage is simply useless as affording any evidence for the case. Why so? Because the word "care" is not an exact rendering of the word κηδεμονίαν. The English word "care" is a flexible term; it may mean an authoritative charge, or merely solicitude on the part of one for another; or, as in the above, one bishop for another bishop in a far distant land; or one part of the Church for the remaining portion thereof.

Now the word κηδεμονία is generally used in Greek literature for expressing solicitude for another as a friend. The rendering then of this word, in order to be accurate, should have been "your solicitude on behalf of the churches." This conveys a totally different meaning from that which the *Guardian* would impose on its readers. Again, the words "the pilot" and "the physician," I will not say are *absolutely* an inaccurate translation according to our English mode of speaking. The article in the Greek language is, you know, emphatically definite, for the purpose of pointing out specially some person, thing, or office. Had S. Chrysostom prefixed the article, then these two words would have had a significancy which they could not have had if the article had been omitted. Now it so happens that the article is wanting, and therefore it is clear that S. Chrysostom did not mean to convey the idea that Venerius was officially THE pilot and THE physician of the Church under her difficulties. How then should we understand the passage? Clearly as follows, "that as the storm at sea points out who is best fitted to be pilot, and as severe diseases of the body indicate him who is the best physician, so too the difficulties of the time show forth him who by his courage and piety is best able to cope with them. There is nothing then in the wording of this letter of S. Chrysostom which implied any *special* office which Venerius of Milan held in regard to the distant churches. The letter is one of simple acknowledgment for the great services Venerius had rendered to the Church in the East, since,

being a skilful "pilot" and "physician," he had assisted the great Oriental patriarch in his difficulties: but there is no word or statement, direct or indirect, explicit or implicit, which points to any office or thing analogous to that of the Sovereign Pontiff; and so the application of the *Guardian* as regards the Papacy is irrelevant.

In a matter of this sort the best commentary is often taken from secular life. Suppose the Church in this case an ordinary kingdom, the Pope the King, the patriarchs or bishops the princes of the blood. Let us imagine that a serious misunderstanding has arisen in a distant portion of the empire, say Edinburgh; that the local prince of Edinburgh, able indeed as he is, being unequal to cope with the difficulties of his situation, addresses himself to the King, to his ministers, and also to many of his brother princes. One of them, say the prince of Oxford, is remarkable for his character as a bold, learned, and skilful leader, having large influence and experience, and possessing that peculiar talent known only to the few, which enabled him to impress the minds of the many with the force of his own ideas and opinions; he comes to the rescue, and by the exercise of his powerful will, and by the excellency of his counsel, he succeeds in overcoming the difficulties of the time, and in restoring peace and harmony. The prince of Edinburgh in his gratitude indites a letter to his fellow prince of Oxford, and he says, "All men have known of old your courage, outspokenness, and free utterance on behalf of the truth; but the present occasion has

displayed with still greater precision your fraternal feeling, your charity, your piety, your sympathy with us, your solicitude on behalf of the provinces of the empire. As the storm at sea especially marks out [the] pilot, and severe diseases of the bodily frame [the] best physician, even so do the difficulties of the time show forth him who zealously cultivates a life of piety and possesses much courage." * Who, I ask, in his sober senses, would infer from this passage any indication that the royal supremacy was invaded, or that words had been used which implied that the King possessed no jurisdiction superior to that of the Prince of Oxford, or that the Prince of Oxford was equal in authority to the King? Certainly nobody except one who was so blinded by his democratic sentiments, that he could not discern the truth, which is patent to every loyal subject of the King. Change again the *dramatis personæ*, the kingdom to the Church, the King to the Pope, the Prince of Oxford to the Bishop of Milan, and the Prince of Edinburgh to the Patriarch of Constantinople, and I ask, can the words of S. Chrysostom be made to question in the least degree the Superior jurisdiction of the Pope, because Venerius of Milan played the part of a most admirable pilot and skilful physician?

5. It is time, now, to consider S. Chrysostom's positive teaching concerning the Papal Supremacy. I admit that he has not asserted very much on the

* I have bracketed the article "the," because the Greek article is wanting in the original.

subject, but what he has written is sufficiently explicit, and when his writings are compared with those of the Fathers in general, and with the acts and decrees of Œcumenical and Plenary Councils, there cannot be a shadow of a doubt, theologically and canonically speaking, that he held the dogma of the Papal Supremacy.

Catholics do not rest their case (and this the *Guardian* admits) on individual Fathers, no matter how illustrious or saintly they may be. If a Catholic Father gives us a large and exhaustive testimony on this subject, well and good; if he is not very communicative, it matters not; and if he should be altogether silent, it is of no consequence, because the proof of a dogma does not depend upon a single Father, but on the *Consensus Patrum* of the Universal Church. Anglicans and Protestants, on the other hand, strive to rebut or neutralize the testimony of the Catholic Church on this cardinal question by separating Father from Father, and endeavouring to prove, from the paucity of his statements on the subject, or from his absolute silence, that he himself did not believe and teach what Catholics believe to be a fundamental truth.

Now the Reviewer in the *Guardian*, and every other well-educated person, ought to know that such a process is contrary to all the principles of sound reason, of criticism, as also of law and equity; contrary, too, to the principles of true theology and of the canon law. Anglican High Churchmen admit this when the subject happens to be the doctrine, say of Baptismal Regeneration or of the Real Presence; why, then, do

they not act fairly in the case of the Supremacy? for it rests upon the same basis as that of every other doctrine of the Church; and the soundness in the base in each case has to be proved by the same process.

Let us now examine briefly what S. Chrysostom witnesses for the first Supreme Pontiff, S. Peter, and I cannot do better than repeat the summary of his evidence as given in my late work, the accuracy of which neither the *Guardian* nor any other periodical has thought it worth its while to dispute:—"He [S. Chrysostom] says that S. Peter is the 'Head or Crown of the Apostles,'* 'the Mouth of the Disciples,'† 'the Pillar of the Church,'† 'the Buttress of the Faith,'† 'the Foundation of the Confession,'† 'Teacher of the habitable globe,'‡ 'the Fisherman of the Universe,'† 'the Head of the Brotherhood,'§ &c.; titles, it must be confessed, indicating the Prerogative of ruling, teaching, leading, and of representing the Church by himself alone."‖ But S. Chrysostom says more than this; he declares that the Lord "entrusted to his [Peter's] hands the Government of the Universal Church,"¶ and "over the Brethren;"** that he (Peter) was "set over the whole habitable world," and "over the entire universe;"§ that in his "hands He [Christ]

* Opera S. Chrysos., t. ii. Hom. iii. de Pœnit. n. 4.
† *Ib.* t. iii. Hom. de Dec. Mill. Talent. n. 3.
‡ *Ib.* t. viii. Hom. lxxxviii. in Joan. n. 6.
§ *Ib.* t. vi. in illud Hoc scitote, n. 4.
‖ "Evidence for the Papacy," p. 43.
¶ Opera S. Chrysos., t. ii. Hom. v. de Pœnit. n. 2.
** *Ib.* t. viii. Hom. lxxxviii. in Joan. n. 1.

placed the Keys of heaven,"* to "whom He entrusted the doing and supporting of all things,"* and to whom "was entrusted by Christ the Flock."† It is then manifest that S. Chrysostom regarded S. Peter as the Supreme Head and Pontiff of the Catholic Church. The two next points are, did S. Chrysostom believe that S. Peter went to Rome, and that he had Successors, not merely to his Apostleship, but to his office as the Shepherd of the whole Flock, *i. e.* as Supreme Pontiff? Upon both points he is explicit. He says that "after having had him [Peter] as our Teacher, we did not retain him, but surrendered him to royal Rome."‡

With respect to his Successors to his Supremacy, S. Chrysostom thus writes: "Christ, speaking to the Leader of the Apostles, says, 'Peter, lovest thou Me?' And upon his affirming that he did, He replies, 'If thou lovest Me, Feed My Sheep.' . . . . Why did Christ shed His Blood? That He might obtain possession of those very Sheep, which he entrusted to Peter and to his Successors."§ The *Guardian* admits this, but adds, "but by Successors he did not mean solely or exclusively the Bishops of Rome." Then what bishops did he mean? When our Lord said to S. Peter, "Feed My Sheep," was He addressing S. Peter only, or the Apostles generally? If the passage means anything,—and the above summary of this Father's evidence of

* Opera S. Chrysos., t. ii. in S. Sq. M. n. 4.
† *Ib.* t. ix. Hom. iii. in Act. App. n. 3.
‡ *Ib.* t. iii. Hom. ii. in Inscrip. Act. n. 6.
§ *Ib.* t. i. De Sacerd. l. ii. n. 1.

S. Peter's position amply proves it—Christ said these words, personally and officially, to S. Peter. By these words he constituted S. Peter the Shepherd of the Apostles themselves, and of the whole Church. By these words, as well as "Thou art Peter," &c., "Confirm thy Brethren," &c., He subjected the Apostles to S. Peter's government, who was to rule them as their "Head," their "Teacher," and their "Leader"; who was also to be to them, as well as to the Church in general, "the Mouth," "the Pillar," "the Foundation," and "the unbroken Rock." S. Peter, then, was the one Shepherd of the whole Church, who received everything singly and alone; while the other Apostles received nothing except as a body united to their "Head" and "Crown," S. Peter. This man—this "Shepherd," this "Head," this "Leader," this "Pillar," this "Foundation," and this "Teacher"—was to have Successors—for the commission to feed was to "S. Peter and his Successors." Who were they, if not the Bishops of Rome? Has any Catholic bishop, except one, ever claimed to be the Shepherd of the whole Church? Did the Patriarchs of Constantinople, who, next to the Roman Bishop, possessed a larger jurisdiction than the others, ever put in such a claim? Not even the ambitious Patriarchs of New Rome. They went as far as they dared, but they never assumed the Supremacy of the Roman Pontiff. There is only one bishop who has claimed to be the Shepherd of the Shepherds, and of the whole Church, which claim has been exercised from the first Pontiff to the present day, and which has been admitted by the Catholic Church as genuine, in all times and under all circumstances.

The Bishops of Rome, then, are the only prelates who were Successors of S. Peter in the shepherdizing of the whole flock. And therefore, when S. Chrysostom said, "and to his Successors," he meant—he could have meant nothing else, but—the Supreme Pontiffs. But we are told all bishops are shepherds. Yes, most certainly they are; but they are subject to one Shepherd, who is their Head and Ruler, and who else can he be but the Pope? For mark, S. Chrysostom is not speaking of S. Peter as an Apostle in this passage, but as one invested with a peculiar function, and that was, to feed, not the sheep of this or that particular fold, established in certain cities, but of the entire fold; that is, all the sheep without exception, which Christ entrusted to the pastoral care of one Master Shepherd, viz. S. Peter. To these offices, then, of Master Shepherd, S. Chrysostom declares there were to be Successors. It is plain to demonstration that the Successors of Peter in this passage means, Successors to his Supreme office of the Shepherd of the whole Fold, to whom the Shepherds of particular folds are subject; and those Successors are the Bishops of Rome, "solely and exclusively" of all other bishops in the world.

S. Chrysostom gives practical illustration of this doctrine when he sought the intervention of the Roman Pontiff to aid him under his difficulties, begging him to admonish his wicked opponents, "and to subject them to the laws of the Church," words which imply, as I have already shown, the exercise of Superior jurisdiction over those defaulters. From the little that S. Chrysostom writes respecting

the Prerogatives of the Roman Pontiffs, it is evident that he held the Papal Supremacy as a divine institution; and if we regard this Father as a Catholic, in intimate union with the whole Brotherhood, holding and teaching the same doctrines which they held and taught, to doubt his orthodoxy on a particular point, because of his comparative silence, is to insult his memory.

§ 3.

S. Basil.

What did S. Basil believe about S. Peter? This must always be the first question asked before we can ascertain very clearly the opinion of any Father who may be either silent or more or less reserved respecting the authority of the Apostolic See. And why do I assert this? Because whatever Christ instituted as an essential part of the constitution of the Catholic Church, was not, and never could be, temporary, but perpetual even to the end of time. If a Supremacy or Primacy (I care not which) was instituted by Christ in the Apostolic College, that Supremacy or Primacy must exist still; and more than that, if one of the functions of that Supremacy or Primacy was to be the source of Jurisdiction, the Rock of Strength to the whole body, the Teacher-general of the brotherhood, and THE Shepherd of the entire Fold, then every baptized Christian, whether he will or no, is bound to adhere to it, under pain of condemnation at the last day. I repeat, no institution of Christ

respecting the Church can possibly come to an end before the second Advent. The apostolical succession in its integrity is a verity included in the very terms of the commission, and confirmed by our Lord himself when He said, "Lo, I am with you all days, even unto the consummation of the world." * Grant that S. Peter received a commission to rule, teach, and feed, distinct from and over and above the rest of the Apostles, then it is a truth self-evident, really requiring no proof, that the commission still exists somewhere on earth, and further, that it is held not by many, not by a synod, not by a general council, but by *one man*, who received it by succession from S. Peter.

What, then, does S. Basil say about S. Peter? In the passages I quoted in my work (which my Criticisers have passed over) there are several points worthy of notice.

He speaks of certain "properties that are connected" with the name Peter. One "property" is that "he [Peter] received upon himself the building of the Church." † That is to say, that Christ in the first instance founded and built the Church, not upon the Apostles in general but upon Peter *alone;* and in order to exhibit the oneness and strength and power of the Church, and her indefectibility, He surnamed this Apostle, whose real name was Simon Bar-jonas, Peter, a word which means a rock. "Thou art Peter [*i. e.* Rock] and upon this Rock I will build my Church,

* S. Matt. xxviii. 20.

† Opera S. Basil., t. i. l. ii. adv. Eunom. n. 4.

and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it."* S. Basil regards S. Peter as both the Foundation and the Building of the Church.

This father next says, "the House of God .... the foundations of which are upon the holy mountains, for it is built upon the foundation of Apostles and Prophets. One also of these mountains was Peter, upon which Rock the Lord promised to build His Church."† Now what does S. Basil infer from this passage? He describes the Church as established (as Isaiah foretold) on the tops of the mountains; one of them, he says, is the Rock of Peter, on which, *i.e.* on this *one mountain*, "the Lord promised to build His Church." What do we understand by these words? We understand that the Church was built exclusively upon S. Peter's Mountain, and that the Churches upon the other mountains were expansions or continuations of the one Rock-mountain of Peter, their unity and cohesion depending entirely upon that one Supreme Rock. This is the evident meaning of the passage, and I defy my Reviewer to explain it away. The one Church was built upon the Mountain of Peter, but by the power of expansion, as from a centre, her circumference gradually increased till she covered the mountains of the world.

S. Peter, S. Basil asserts, "received a greater testimony and blessing than the rest."‡ If all the Apostles were equal in jurisdiction, as Anglicans

* S. Matt. xvi. 18.

† Opera S. Basil., t. i. Comment. in Esai., c. ii. n. 66.

‡ *Ib.* t. ii. p. i. Procem. de Judic. Dei, n. 7.

assert, how could S. Peter receive a "greater testimony and blessing, or benediction, than the rest"? S. Basil is not here speaking of a "blessing" *personal* to S. Peter, but one that was official; the context shows this, for he describes S. Peter as the "Instrument" of God in the judgment pronounced upon Ananias, who had lied to the Holy Ghost. It might be asked, why S. Peter more than S. John or any other Apostle? S. Basil gives the reason, because he was the One "preferred before all the disciples," having "received a greater testimony and blessing than the rest." S. Peter then was Superior to the rest, according to S. Basil. He was "greater"; "greater" in authority and power, having received a larger "blessing"; greater, because he was the One "who was preferred."

The blessing then was not personal to himself merely, but official, one affecting the Apostles and the Church, in that he was "greater" than his brethren. In what consisted that greatness? S. Basil tells us, "He [Peter] to whom was entrusted the Keys of the Kingdom of heaven."* S. Basil then held that S. Peter was the Foundation, the Building itself of the Church, the Rock of the Church, the "Instrument" of God in His judgments, the One to whom a greater power had been given, the One to whom Christ "entrusted the Keys of heaven."

Now it must be conceded that passages concerning the Sovereign Pontiff, especially if there be any doubt as to their meaning, ought to be

* Opera S. Basil., t. ii. p. i. Procem. de Judic. Dei, n. 7.

compared to similar ones which relate to the First Apostle. Because if S. Peter was the divinely-appointed Head of the Church, and armed with Superior jurisdiction, then it follows from reasons above stated, that Successors to his office possess similar powers.

Let us now re-examine S. Basil's letter to the Pope S. Damasus. In the midst of the storm of evil that ravaged the fair East, S. Basil turns his eyes to the Supreme Pontiff and says "we have looked forward to the Visit of your kindliness, as the only solution of these things."* Why the "only solution of these things"? This "Visit" not occurring, S. Basil earnestly appeals to the Pope, urging him to "help us, and send persons who agree with us in sentiment," for the purpose of "reconciling those who are at variance," and of "restoring to mutual love the Churches of God."† By what power and authority could the Pope by his Visitation, or by his legates, or by his Letter, reconcile those who were divided, and "restore to mutual love the Churches of God"? To do this implies two things in the person appealed to, viz. jurisdiction and power. Whence that jurisdiction, and whence that power? If the Oriental defaulters would not listen to the bishops of their own part of the world, why should they listen to a bishop who is far distant, and had no more connection with them (at least, so say the Anglicans) than the bishop of Milan or of any other see?

S. Basil next refers to an incident which occurred

* Opera S. Basil., t. iii. Ep. lxx. ad Damas. † *Ib.*

a century previous to his time, which, to say the least, is a very remarkable one, and to which none of my Criticisers, save the *Church Review*, have alluded. He says "that Dionysius . . . [A.D. 259] visited by his Letters our Church of Cæsarea, and comforted by them our fathers, and sent persons to redeem our brethren from slavery."*

We all know well enough the meaning of visitation by Letters on the part of the Pope. These Letters were not merely letters of courtesy, but of authority, obedience to which was obligatory. An illustration occurs to me in the great Council of Ephesus, to which the Pope addressed authoritative Letters, which the Fathers accepted not as an act of deference, but as of obedience; for the acts say they were "compelled by the necessity," not only of the canons, but "by the Letters of our most holy Father and Colleague, Celestine, Bishop of the Roman Church."† This is language, as I have elsewhere observed, that could not have been employed with reference to any other bishop, except in relation to his diocese, or province, or patriarchate. The only bishop who could by his Letters bind the Universal Church in Œcumenical Council assembled, was the Pope. The *Church Review* ridiculed this idea, and promised some further remarks on the subject in another article; but the promise was not fulfilled.

This "Visitation by Letter" was an act of Superior authority, to which submission was due.

* Opera S. Basil., t. iii. Ep. lxx. ad Damas.

† Labbe's Concil., t. iii. col. 1078.

The object of the Visitation was redemption from slavery; but what sort of slavery? I think S. Basil explains what such a slavery might at least have meant, at any rate what it meant in his day, when he himself invoked the assistance of the Pontiff. He thus continues his epistle: "But things are now with us in a more difficult and sad position, and need great care. For we grieve not over the overthrow of earthly buildings, but the downfall of Churches; nor do we behold bodily slavery, but the slavery of souls, daily effected by those who are battling for heresy. So that, unless you [the Pontiff] be moved to aid us at once, you will not, in a short time, find any one to stretch out your hand to, as all will have passed away under the sway of heresy."* What was the purport of these remarks? As the whole letter explains, the Saint wanted the Pope to do what his predecessor S. Dionysius had done before, viz. to "visit" his Church, "as the only" method of bringing about "a solution of these things,"—that is, the extirpation of heresy, the "reconciliation of those who were at variance," and the "restoration to mutual love of the Churches of God," viz. the Churches of the East, distracted with heresy; in a word, the emancipation of the Churches from "the slavery of heresy."

Now, in all sober earnestness, I ask my opponents to tell me what was the object of S. Basil's letter to Rome? What did he mean by "Visitation by Letter," and what measures did he wish the Pope to take? Was not his object to invoke

* Opera S. Basil., t. iii. Ep. lxx. ad Damas.

the Supreme Power in the Church for remedying existing evils? If it was not, then his language is simply unintelligible and without real point. His object, however, was clear and definite, viz. as I have just observed, to invoke the Supreme authority in the Catholic Church, that of the Supreme Pontiff, to solve the difficulties with which the Churches in the East were then involved, to restore charity and to extirpate heresy.

The case of Eustathius determines beyond all doubt what S. Basil understood by the Papal Supremacy. This prelate, the bishop of Sebaste, had been deposed by a synod; he appealed to Rome, and returned with Letters from the Pope ordering his restoration to his See, and when the Synod of Tyana read them, he was immediately restored.* In this matter S. Basil does not complain of any stretch of power on the part of the Pope. I would ask my Reviewer, if this had been an illegal act of the Pope, whether S. Basil would not have protested against it as a grievous usurpation, and a violation of the law of the Church? But no such protest appears in his letter, nay, he admits the Pope's right, for he tells him, "Since then from you has arisen his power to injure the Churches . . . . from you [the Pope] must come also the correction, to be communicated to the Churches by Letter,"† &c.

It seems, then, clear to demonstration that S. Basil held the Papal Supremacy; he regarded S. Peter, as I have shown above, as Superior to the rest of the Apostles in jurisdiction, and he

* Opera S. Basil., Ep. cclxiii. Occident., n. 3. † *Ib.*

believed that the Pope, whose authority he invoked for the rescue of the Eastern Church from the "slavery of heresy," occupied the same position in the Catholic Church.

And what has my Reviewer to say against all this? First, he insinuates that the Pope was not infallible; secondly, in a Letter addressed to "*all* the Western bishops," S. Basil warns them "not to receive Christians from the East into communion without examination"; and thirdly, he says, "what succour can we find in Western pride?"* A few remarks on these three points will suffice.

And first, with respect to the ironical remarks of my Reviewer on the infallibility of the Pope. It is really very difficult to refrain from charging our opponents with downright dishonesty, and with a determination to shut their eyes to truth; but charity forbids us. Now, what has the infallibility of the Pope to do with the question before us? The error of the Pope in the case of Bishop Eustathius, if it was an error, was one of *fact*, not concerning doctrine. He was either guilty or not guilty of holding heretical views. Anglican High-Churchmen hold the infallibility of Œcumenical Councils in their decrees of faith, not in matters of fact, so we Catholics believe the Pope to be also infallible when he teaches *ex cathedra*, that is, by the authority of the Chair of Peter; but no one maintains that the Pope is infallible in questions involving matters of fact. Grant that

* The *Guardian*, Aug. 31, 1870.

the Pope was wrong in his judgment respecting the character and guilt of Eustathius, how does that affect the doctrine of the Papal Supremacy? The insinuation of my Reviewer is at least disingenuous and unworthy of his position as a respectable controversialist. I am at a loss to perceive how S. Basil warning *all* (the italics are my Reviewer's) the Western bishops, "especially those of Gaul and Italy," against Eastern heretics, is an argument against the Papacy. I presume, if we had English heretics travelling on the Continent, who by duplicity and fraud induced the curés of foreign parishes to admit them to the Catholic altars, the Archbishop of Westminster might address letters to *all* the bishops of Europe warning them not to receive them, without intending to ignore the Papal authority.

The only strong point my Reviewer has made is the reference to S. Basil's letter to Eusebius of Samosata. His argument is this, that S. Basil having in these letters asked "what succour can we find in Western pride?" and having further on stated his intention "of writing to *their* Coryphæus" "to intimate to him that they do not know the truth of what is passing among us, and do not take the way to learn it; [and] that they ought not to insult those who are crushed by temptation, nor to take pride for dignity,"* therefore, it is alleged, S. Basil did not hold the Papal Supremacy. It is certainly remarkable how prone Anglicans are to seize upon any incident in

* The *Guardian*, Aug. 31, 1870.

ecclesiastical history, no matter what the circumstance might be, which seems to tell against the Supremacy of the Holy See. Words said or written under feelings of irritation, are forced into prominence, if, forsooth, some expression escapes, which indicates an apparent denial of the Pope's position or authority. In the face of the passages from S. Basil's extant writings, referred to above, how can it be said that because he spoke of the Holy Father as "their Coryphæus," that he thereby denied his Supremacy over the whole Church in the East as well as the West? If S. Basil really believed that the Pope was no more than a great bishop, or rather the bishop of the First See, first in rank only, but possessing as such no jurisdiction, would he have invited the assistance of Pope S. Damasus to send persons to "reconcile those who are at variance," and "to restore to mutual love the Churches of God," and would he have so earnestly begged the Pope to "aid us at once," else "in a short time he would find no one to stretch out his hand to, as all will have passed under the sway of heresy." Does the *Guardian* mean to aver that S. Basil, great Doctor as he was, would have uttered such words as these, if he did not believe in the Papal Supremacy, and that when he employed, in his letter to Eusebius, the term "their Coryphæus," he meant that the Pope's Superior jurisdiction was limited by the boundaries of the Western empire? *

* Yet this certainly is what the Reviewer meant his readers to understand, viz. that S. Basil did not believe that the Pope pos-

Then what did S. Basil mean by the expression "*their* Coryphæus or Chief"? This is to be determined by ascertaining in what capacity he was

sessed any authority over the East. In a note appended to the term "their Coryphæus," he says, "This expression deserves notice. S. Basil terms the Bishop *their* [the Westerns'] Chief or Coryphæus; a very different thing from a universal Patriarch."—(*Guardian*, Aug. 31, 1870.) The contention, then, of the *Guardian* is, that the Pope was nothing more than the Patriarch of the West. In the text I have proved how impossible this could be; but I am now concerned in exposing the extraordinary conduct of my Reviewer in this matter. He has drawn his inspiration from the Gallican Fleury, under whose ægis he endeavours to put an interpretation upon this expression of S. Basil, "their Coryphæus," which Fleury utterly repudiates. This historian says, "The hard expressions that he [S. Basil] urges against the Bishop of Rome relate only to the person of Damasus, whom he knew only by the report of others. As for the authority of the Holy See, and the necessity of having recourse to it, he shows this sufficiently in his letter to S. Athanasius and those of the West."—(Fleury, H. E., l. xvii. c. xxxi.; Herb. Tr., vol. ii. p. 484.) The text of this extract my Reviewer had not the courage to produce; he contented himself with giving his own gloss upon it, as follows: "Fleury remarks, *à propos* of these letters, that S. Basil has elsewhere shown his respect for the Holy See, as in his letter to S. Athanasius, that he had no personal feeling towards Pope Damasus, whom he only knew in a distant way; and that he did not mean to question the purity of the Roman faith, respecting which he elsewhere speaks favourably, but only to intimate that the Western prejudice against S. Meletius and S. Eusebius of Samosata gave great advantage to the heretics."—(*Guardian*, Aug. 31, 1870.) All this is verbiage, and nothing to the point: what Fleury says is, that S. Basil had, in his letters to S. Athanasius, specially recognized "the *authority* of the Holy See," and also "*the necessity of having recourse to it*"; and therefore, in speaking of the Patriarch of the West as "their Coryphæus," he did not mean to deny the Superior jurisdiction of the Pope over the whole Church.

speaking of the Supreme Pontiff. He was angry with the Pope because of the Meletian quarrel; he was irritated with the Western bishops because he considered they were receiving into communion persons who, in his estimation, were heretics and schismatics; acting without taking the trouble of informing themselves of the real state of the matter then in controversy; and then he adds that he will "write to *their* Coryphæus." The question then is, what office of the Pope was S. Basil alluding to when he said he would write to "their Coryphæus"? The answer is, their Patriarch.

The Pope is in possession of four offices: first, Bishop of Rome proper; secondly, Archbishop of the Roman province; thirdly, Patriarch of the West; and fourthly, Supreme Pontiff, having plenary jurisdiction over the whole Catholic Church in the East as well as the West. Was it not then to the *Patriarch* of the West that S. Basil threatened to write, in complaint of the conduct of the Westerns, who were his *immediate* subjects? and not to the Chief Shepherd of the Universal Church? This seems to have been plainly the case, and for this reason, that the subtle oriental mind was accustomed to draw such distinctions of rank and office in the persons of the bishops of the great sees. The following is a notable example, taken from a letter of S. Cyril of Alexandria to Pope S. Leo the Great, in which he describes his great predecessor, Celestine, "Archbishop of all the habitable world," and "Father and Patriarch of the mighty city of Rome": that is, he was Archbishop and Chief Shepherd of the entire fold of

Christ, the Bishop of Rome, and Patriarch of the western patriarchate." *

What S. Basil meant then was, that he would write to the Patriarch of the West to complain of the conduct of the bishops *immediately* subject to him in the matter concerning the Oriental quarrel. That he could not have intended to exclude the East from the Supreme jurisdiction of the Pope, is evident from a letter addressed by him to the West, in which he says, "It is befitting for us to write to the Bishop of Rome to supervise our state . . . and to use his authority in this matter, choosing men able to undergo the toils of the journey,—able too, with mildness and firmness, to reprove the perverse hopes of parties here." And concerning the conduct of Paulinus, he says, in the same letter, "As regards Paulinus, whether there has been anything to blame, as regards his ordination, it is for you to say. This grieves us in him, that he leans towards the doctrine of Marcellus, and admits his followers indiscriminately to holy communion . . . we ask that care be given

* Opera S. Cyril. Alex., t. v. p. ii.; Encom. in S. Mariam Deip., p. 384.

I have heard that even now the Pope exercises his several offices of Diocesan Bishop, Archbishop and Metropolitan, Patriarch and Supreme Pontiff, separately, without confusion of jurisdictions. If this is so, it fully explains the term "*their* Coryphæus," or chief, in relation to the Western bishops. As simple Bishop of Rome, he is the "Coryphæus" of the diocese of Rome; as Archbishop and Metropolitan, "Coryphæus" of the province of Rome; as Patriarch, "Coryphæus" of the Western patriarchate; and as the Pontifex Maximus, the "Coryphæus" of the whole Catholic Church throughout the world.

by you to that matter. It will be given if you vouchsafe to write to all the Churches in the East, that those who adhere to those adulterate doctrines, if indeed they repent, are to be received into communion, but if they choose tenaciously to remain in them, they are to be separated from the Church."*

In the above extracts the following points are noteworthy: (1) That general supervision of the Churches belongs to the Popes; (2) that it was for the West to say whether Paulinus was or was not lawfully ordained; (3) that the West had authority "to write to all the Churches in the East"; and (4) that the solution of the question, whether persons are or are not in communion with the Church, belongs to the West to determine. Take the last passage and compare it with his epistle to the Pope, it is clear he believed that the Pope had jurisdiction over the East, and hence the only legitimate conclusion that can be arrived at is, that the term "Coryphæus," in the passage quoted, alludes to his authority over the West as their Patriarch.

It will doubtless be asserted that this is a very far-fetched interpretation, violent and unnatural. Surely not. Is it not much more violent and unnatural to make a writer contradict himself, if the passage may be so explained as to be in harmony with what he has written generally on the subject in question? To construe the term "their Coryphæus," so as to exclude the Superior office of Chief Shepherd, would make S. Basil's

* Opera S. Basil., Ep. cclxiii. Occident., n. i. 5.

sentiments on the point contradictory to each other. The question is simply this, can the term "their Coryphæus" be so explained as to be consistent with the sentiments penned by S. Basil in his letter to Pope S. Damasus, when requesting his assistance to quell the Oriental schism? I have shown how this can be done: I have shown how it can bear no other meaning than the office of Patriarch of the West. But let it be assumed there is a doubt; then the *Consensus Patrum*, as expressed chiefly in the acts and decrees of Œcumenical and Plenary Councils, especially "the voice of two great gatherings accepted throughout Christendom as Œcumenical," are at hand to place upon it the true interpretation: and as S. Basil was a Catholic Bishop, in communion with the Holy See, it follows that he could never have intended to use the words "*their* Coryphæus" in the sense the *Guardian* has most arbitrarily put upon them.

§ 4.

S. Gregory of Nazianzum.

Before passing from the Eastern to the Western parts of the Holy Catholic Church, let us examine the criticism of the *Guardian*, on the testimony of S. Gregory of Nazianzum, which that periodical has placed prominently forward in this controversy. The following words of S. Gregory are quoted as a proof against the Papal Supremacy: "It [*i. e.* Constantinople] is the eye of the world; the link between East and West; hither it is that from every side

assembles and meets together all that is great; hence is it that everything starts and is spread abroad, as *from the common emporium of the faith* (ὡς ἀπὸ ἐμπορίου κοινοῦ τῆς πίστεως)."* No reference is given for this passage. But on the very face of it, it will not bear the interpretation attempted to be fastened on it. Constantinople was the Imperial capital, the seat of government, the residence of the Emperor and the Senate, and in ecclesiastical jurisdiction its patriarch was supreme over all the East, to whom appeals travelled from those parts of the world. The city then became naturally the "eye of the world," and also the "link between the East and West," for therein took place those "assemblies" the decisions of which affected both East and West. The point of the passage is this, "hence is it that everything starts and is spread abroad as *from the common emporium* of the faith." At first sight these words were startling, because they seemed to infer that all power and jurisdiction in respect to faith was centred in that oriental city. But it may be shown, from two points of view, that this clause cannot mean what the *Guardian* supposes possible. First, an "emporium" is, as you are aware, and was especially in those days, a place for the disposal of merchandise; not the merchandise itself.

The custom in those days (for there were no shops) was for merchants to bring their goods into their "emporium," where they were sold to various customers. Now the commodity in the "emporium"

* The *Guardian*, Aug. 24, 1870.

alluded to by S. Gregory, was "the Faith": so here we have three points, (1) the commodity, (2) the place of exposition, called "the emporium," and (3) the persons by whom it was purchased, *i. e.* the faithful. As all merchandise was brought from some place into "the emporium," so likewise was the Faith deposited in this spiritual emporium, derived from some common source (for the emporium is not itself the source or spring or origin of the merchandise, but only its receptacle), from whence it was imported. Where then was the source or spring of the Catholic Faith? The whole body of the fathers, and S. Gregory among them, assert that it was in S. Peter, on whom the Lord built and founded His Church; and after him in his Successors the Roman Pontiffs, who "fill his place," in whom Peter "ever lives and exercises his judicial powers," "even to the present time." The Chair, then, of Peter was and is the source and spring of the Catholic faith. The Faith deposited in "the emporium" of Constantinople was derived originally from that Chair, and by its means it "started and spread abroad" to all parts of the East. Taking the clause as it is presented by the *Guardian*, it makes nothing against the Papacy.

But in the second place, it must be observed that the translation is scarcely correct. S. Gregory does not call Constantinople "*the* common emporium of the faith"; the definite Greek article is wanting, and therefore the rendering ought to have been thus: "hence is it that everything starts and is spread abroad as from a common emporium of the faith." There is a vast difference between "*the*

common emporium of the faith," and "*a* common emporium of the faith"; the former is one common to the whole world, the other common to a certain district, be it large or small; the former is universal in its application, the other limited and circumscribed.

Every episcopal city is "a common emporium of the faith to the diocese," which receives the precious merchandise from the true source, *i.e.* the Chair of Peter at Rome; from which it is dispensed to the faithful in every part of the diocese. So much for the antidote of the *Guardian* against Ultramontane poison, which fails in its effect, from the circumstance that the principal ingredient in the prescription is adulterated, I will not say purposely, but by an oversight.

Let us now ascertain S. Gregory's own opinion respecting the position of Rome and the Pope: "We have not come for the dishonouring of the Great Shepherd, who Presides over the illustrious city. We know him honourable, we recognize him as Head, we call him holy, even though unjustly treated by him. Let him only be loving to his children, and provident for the whole Church."* Again, writing about the two Romes, he thus distinguishes Rome proper: "The faith [of old Rome] was of old, and even now is orthodox, welding together the whole West by the saving word, as is right in her [*i. e.* Rome] who Presides over All, venerating [*i. e.* with religious respect] the whole harmonious teaching of God."† From these

* Opera S. Greg. Naz., Orat. 13, n. 2.

† Carm. de Vita sua, vv. 568–573.

two passages it is manifest that S. Gregory recognized the Superior jurisdiction, in matters of faith, of the Holy See, as the President of the Catholic Church and of the Catholic Faith (*i. e.* "Head of all the Faith,"—see Œcumenical Council of Ephesus), and as the One who is "provident for the whole Church."

It is noteworthy that S. Gregory calls the Pope "Head," and admits the Faithful in his province or patriarchate to be "his children." This is what the Council of Chalcedon said to the Pope S. Leo, "over whom thou hast presided as Head over the members,"* *i. e.* the Fathers of the Council. It is, then, simply impossible that S. Gregory could have meant to infer that Constantinople was "THE common emporium of the faith." What he meant, and what he actually did say, was, that that city was "*a* common emporium of the faith," *i. e.* the See of Constantinople was the centre of unity to the East, as Rome was to the whole world, the East included.

§ 5.

S. Jerome.

The criticisms on the testimony of S. Jerome to the Supremacy are certainly most extraordinary, and, I will add, utterly inadmissible as proofs that he did not hold that cardinal principle on which the whole hierarchy of the Church is founded, and by which it is preserved in its full integrity even

* Labbe, Concil. Chalcedon. Œcu., t. iv. col. 1775.

to this day. It is very true that S. Jerome had a "fiery temper,"* which was "his most grievous failing,"* and that, in his vexation about the affairs of Antioch, he should have on "such an occasion burst out into strong expressions";* but what has this to do with his assertions concerning the Supremacy? and how can this affect, one way or the other, the question at issue between us? S. Jerome was not the only Saint who had an irascible temper. It is written in Holy Writ, that the "contention was so sharp between" S. Paul and S. Barnabas "that they departed asunder, one from the other";† but who, in their senses, would refer to this incident as an argument against the authority of those Apostles?

The remarks respecting the Meletian schism I have disposed of above, and shall not again refer to it; but let me repeat what S. Jerome did say concerning Peter and his Successors. His "fiery temper" may aid us to ascertain his real sentiments, better, perhaps, than when he said, "as Plato was the prince of philosophers, so was Peter the prince of the Apostles." Respecting S. Peter, S. Jerome asserted—(1) that upon "Peter the Lord built the Church";‡ (2) that "the

* The *Guardian*, Aug. 31, 1870. † Acts xv. 39.

‡ Opera S. Hieron., t. i. Ep. xli. n. 2, ad Marcell.

The following observation of S. Jerome is an exhaustive interpretation of this passage: "The safety of the Church depends upon the dignity of the Supreme Priest, to whom, if a certain unshared and eminent power be not granted by all, there will be as many schisms in the Church as there are priests."—T. ii. adv. Luciferi., n. 9.

strength of the Church is settled equally upon "the Apostles, yet for this reason One is chosen out of the Twelve, that, a Head being constituted, the occasion of schism might be removed."* It is plain to demonstration that S. Jerome believed, first, that S. Peter was the Chief Apostle on whom the Lord built the Church; and, secondly, that he was appointed "the Head," not by way of pre-eminence to fill the office of a chairman or president merely, but to maintain and enforce order and unity in the College of the Apostles. He was therefore, in the opinion of S. Jerome, the Governor and Ruler of his brethren; indeed, he expressly calls him "the Chief Pontiff of the Christians."† Such was S. Peter in the opinion of S. Jerome.

And now as regards the Pope: in the midst of the confusion of oriental affairs S. Jerome turns his eyes towards Rome, seeking from the Holy See the proper remedy for the settlement of the "storm-tossed Churches of the East." Why does he turn to Rome? He does not appeal to Rome as the principal city of the world, nor to her Bishop as simply Bishop of Rome, nor to the Prelate of the Imperial city,

* Opera S. Hieron., t. ii. adv. Jovin., l. i. n. 26.

† *Ib.* t. viii. Chron. Euseb. ad ann. 44.

This remarkable passage is from the Chronicle of Eusebius, which S. Jerome translated into Latin. The original is, Πέτρος ὁ κορυφαῖος πρώτην ἐν Αντιοχείᾳ θεμελιώσας ἐκκλησίαν, &c.; Peter the Head, having founded the Church first in Antioch, &c. The value of the passage in a critical sense is inestimable, for it gives the exact meaning of the Greek word ὁ κορυφαῖος, so often employed by the Greek Fathers in connection with S. Peter, namely, that he was the "High Pontiff, or High Priest of the Christians."

surrounded as he was, even in those days, with the state and ceremonial which was his due; he says, "Away with the pride of the topmost dignity of Rome." No, it was not to the mere Court of Rome to which he appealed, it was to the Holy See of Peter, and the "Successor of the Fisherman," from whom he sought the solution of those oriental entanglements of which he complained. "I speak with the Successor of the Fisherman, and the disciple of the Cross. Following no Chief but Christ, I am joined in communion with your Holiness, that is, with the Chair of Peter."* He appealed to the Pope, not as mere Bishop of Rome; he sought his intervention, not in his capacity of private Doctor, or official head simply, but to the Pope *ex cathedra*. He wished the Chair of Peter to speak and determine the unseemly controversies; or, to use modern language, he desired to obtain from the Pope a decree *ex cathedra*, which would bind himself and the Church. "Upon that Rock [*i. e.* the Chair of Peter wherein sits the Successor of the Fisherman] I know that the Church is built";† the whole fabric of the Church, East and West, North and South, S. Jerome held to be indissolubly united to that one Rock-Chair, from which, as from a centre, the whole Church is preserved in faith and unity. "Whosoever," he continues, "eats the Lamb [*i. e.* the Eucharist] out of this house [*i. e.* the holy Roman Catholic Church] is profane";‡ that is, whosoever

* *Ib.* t. i. Ep. xv. ad Damas. Papam, n. 2.
† *Ib.* ‡ *Ib.*

shall communicate with any church, conventicle, or assembly which is out of the communion with the "Successor of the Fisherman" and of the "Chair of Peter," "is profane," and will perish; for, as he says, "If any be not in the Ark of Noah [*i. e.* the Church united with the Chair of Peter and with its occupant], he will perish whilst the deluge prevaileth."* I ask in all earnestness, can there be a more explicit witness for the truth of the Roman Supremacy as derived from that of S. Peter than the above extracts from S. Jerome's works?

How, then, does the *Guardian* evade the direct positive evidence of this great Father? He endeavours to destroy his credit as a witness for this truth by pointing out that he "was educated at Rome," that he had been "secretary to Pope Damasus," and more than once, he asserts, he was "a personal friend of Damasus." He alludes to his unfortunate irritability of temper, and the "famous correspondence which passed between himself and S. Augustine." In a word, feeling the force of the clear, definite, positive, and direct testimony of S. Jerome, the *Guardian* has recourse to the very questionable means of destroying on the above grounds his credit as a witness.

There is an old saying and a true one, "*in vino veritas.*" No matter whether the infirmity be caused by over much wine, or by uncontrollable temper, the results are often the same; viz. the utterance of some truth which might otherwise have remained unspoken. Tertullian, in his mad-

* Opera S. Hieron., t. i. Ep. xv. ad Damas. Papam, n. 2.

ness as a Montanist heretic, proclaimed the Pope as "the Supreme Pontiff," the "Interpreter of God," the "Bishop of Bishops," the "Good Shepherd," the One who "presides," and the One who claims the power of "binding and loosing," by virtue of the Keys which S. Peter alone received; and now S. Jerome, under the action of fire, not indeed, in this instance, from ill-temper, but from holy indignation at the scandals in the East, loudly cries out to the Pope for the redress which he alone could give.

I apologise to S. Jerome for coupling his name with Tertullian after he became a heretic, and also for the application of the Latin proverb suggested by the conduct of the Reviewer in the *Guardian*. But this writer admits that this great Saint was one of the four doctors of the early Latin Church: is it possible, then, that he can seriously believe he is helping the cause, not merely of the Church of England, or of any party in that Church, but of Christ and Christianity, by his disingenuous manner of evading the very strong evidence of this great doctor, and by throwing dust in the eyes of his readers; thus preventing them from seeing its full force and strength. Is this the way to serve Christ, to promote religion and the cause of "the reunion of Christendom," which many earnest and good men so ardently desire?

The insinuations of the *Guardian* are noteworthy: (1) the corruption, in the time of S. Damasus, of the Roman Church, in the midst of which S. Jerome was educated, and whose purity of doctrine was sullied by the false teachings re-

specting the Papacy; and (2) the partiality of S. Jerome as the secretary and friend of the Pope, which induced him to utter sentiments concerning the Papal Supremacy which were false. Now the Reviewer in the *Guardian* must be well aware that the implied charges against the Roman Church and S. Jerome cannot be substantiated. S. Ambrose, S. Augustine, S. Chrysostom, S. Basil, S. Gregory of Nazianzum, the Œcumenical Councils of Ephesus and Chalcedon would never have spoken of the Roman Church in the way they did if they believed that the atmosphere of Rome was so corrupt as to infect the youthful Jerome and others with false ideas of the Popedom.

Indeed, so pure was the Catholic Church at that time, that even the Anglican Reformers were compelled to acknowledge this fact, which they did in the following language: ". . . . The Primitive Church, which was most pure and incorrupt."* "And therefore the Primitive Church, which is especially to be followed as most incorrupt and pure."† And the age of the Primitive Church is defined to be a period of upwards of 400 or 500 years after Christ. The statute 1 Edw. VI. c. i. s. 7, still unrepealed, says that it embraces "the space of 500 years or more after Christ's ascension."‡

* Hom. Idol., Pt. i. † *Ib.* Pt. iii.

‡ The Homilies of the Church of England do not agree with the statute as regards the period of the "incorrupt" Primitive Church. In the Homily on "Idolatry" it says that the Church "next the Apostles' time was most pure"; and further on in the same Homily it says, "Lo! unto the time of Constantine, by the space of above 300 years after our Saviour Christ, the Christian

So pure and incorrupt was the Primitive Church, that the Reformers assert that the "godly Fathers before and since Christ" were "endued, without doubt with the Holy Ghost, and most certainly certified of God's holy will."*

The insinuations, then, of the *Guardian*, that possibly S. Jerome had become infected with false ideas of the Papacy during the time of his education in Rome, and that his mind had been influenced from his personal partiality for the Supreme Pontiff, S. Damasus, is simply untrue, having no other foundation than the opinion of my Reviewer, and of such writers as Dr. Barrow, whose object is to serve the "Church of their Baptism," without regard to the absolute requirements of sterling truth. The *Guardian* quotes S. Jerome's words: "I know not Vitalis; I *repudiate Meletius* [the italics are his own]; I am a stranger to Paulinus. Whosoever gathereth not with thee scattereth; that is, whosoever is not of Christ is of Antichrist." And he then puts the question: "Did the Catholic Church accept the dictates of this urgent manifesto?" To which he replies, "Most certainly not."† If the *Guardian*

religion was most pure and indeed golden." Queen Elizabeth adds another century, *i. e.* "from the time of the Apostles, and above 400 years after, when doctrine and religion were most pure."—(Strype's "Life of Whitgift," vol. i. p. 197, ed. 1822.) All these Anglican periods of Catholic purity will include the time of the great Fathers and Doctors of the Church till the close of the fifth century. If Rome had been as corrupt as the *Guardian* implies, would the Homilies not have mentioned so notable a fact?

* Hom. Almsdeeds, Pt. i.

† The *Guardian*, Aug. 31, 1870.

means that the Catholic Church did not accept the judgment of the Pope respecting the claims of either party, the answer is simple, that no "judgment" had been pronounced by the Holy See. For my remarks on this point I refer you to the preceding chapter. If no judgment had been pronounced, then the "dictates of this urgent manifesto" were at that time neither accepted nor rejected. If, however, the *Guardian* maintains, as it seems to do, that the *principles* of the Papal Supremacy respecting the election and confirmation of the bishops of the Patriarchal Sees, as contained in this "urgent manifesto," had not been admitted by the Catholic Church, then the *Guardian* is in error; for it was a law of the Church that all bishops, on their election, should be, either immediately, or mediately through their Metropolitans, confirmed by the Holy See. I refer my Reviewer to Dr. Döllinger, for whom he has a very high opinion as an historian and theologian, for the elucidation of this point. As I shall have occasion to quote what the Doctor has written on this subject further on, I forbear doing so here. But if my Reviewer would reconsider his assertions, he will find that he is mistaken in his facts, and that he has utterly failed in destroying the testimony of S. Jerome respecting the Superiority of the Holy See over every other see throughout the Empire-Church of Christ.

§ 6.

S. Augustine.

My Reviewer in the *Guardian* quotes Janus, with the view of exposing the absurdity of the notion that S. Augustine held the doctrine of the Papal Supremacy. Janus says: "Yet from all his numerous works, filling ten folios, only one sentence, in one letter, can be quoted, where he says that the principality of the Apostolic Chair has always been in Rome, which could, of course, be said then with equal truth of Antioch, Jerusalem, and Alexandria. Any reader of his Pastoral Letter to the separated Donatists on the unity of the Church, must find it inexplicable, on the Jesuit theory, that in these seventy-five chapters there is not a single word on the necessity of communion with Rome as the centre of unity. He urges all sorts of arguments to show that the Donatists are bound to return to the Church, but of the Papal Chair, as one of them, he knows nothing!"*

I for one have a profound love and veneration for the much maligned order of the Jesuits, whose greatest honour is derived from the fact, that of all the holy societies belonging to the Catholic Church, they are the most hated and dreaded. Why is this? The answer is obvious,—because of their name. The Name Jesus is hated by the world, by the powers of the world, and by the Evil One, who rules the world. A Society called by that

* The *Guardian*, Aug. 31, 1870.

name—even the Society of Jesus—could not fail for that reason alone to bring down upon itself the wrath of Satan, and the odium of every government, state, or party, whose worldly maxims and policy Jesus abominates; and therefore the Society whose principles are founded upon the law of Jesus Christ, employing, as it does, every means approved by God for resisting the same and for promoting truth and justice, is, and ever will be, the object of the malignity of the world. All honour to the Jesuits, living martyrs for the truth of God, the objects of the darts of hell, against whom the finger of scorn is ever tremblingly pointed, and against whose character the lying tongues of men are ever busy to effect their ruin. Jesus Christ was falsely slandered, and condemned as a malefactor; so the order called after His Name enjoys a similar honour—a primacy of honour in the court of suffering—to be followed, as in the case of their divine Master, by triumphant victory over the powers of evil.

I assume, of course, that my Reviewer accepts the statements contained in the above quotation as his own, and I shall therefore treat it accordingly. But what can be said on his behalf, who, under the mask of Janus, endeavours to mislead his readers and draw them away from the main issue of the question before us?

1. He asserts, "Yet from all his numerous works, filling ten folios, only one sentence, in one letter, can be quoted, where he says that the principality of the Apostolic Chair has always been in Rome." Is this true? Yes, I admit it, if he meant simply the *ipsissima verba* in this passage. But no one would

suppose he meant this, especially after reading the concluding clause of the above extract, "but of the Papal Chair . . . . he knows nothing." He meant his readers to understand that in the ten folios of S. Augustine's works he has given no distinct and definite testimony in favour of the Supremacy of the Holy See. This is what he meant his readers to infer, and in so doing he has led them to a conclusion absolutely false. Charity forbids one to say he did this *consciously*, for I know well from my own experience that many false conclusions may be drawn, without being in the least aware that the arguments were fallacious, leading to utterly false issues.

The mode of operation, as I must repeat, on the part of Anglican controversialists against the Catholic doctrine of the Papal Supremacy is this: (1) to separate S. Peter's position from that of his Successors; (2) to separate a Father from all other Fathers, and from the Œcumenical and Plenary Councils; and having thus separated him from the rest of the Church, to pin him down to his own statements, and interpret him not by the *Ecclesia docens*, but by such interpretations as they are pleased to put upon his statements. Such is the method they adopt with respect to all Fathers, especially those who have written but little on the subject, or who have expressed themselves in language which they think is vague and indefinite. This is the Anglican mode of controversy when the Papacy is concerned; not so, as I have shown above, when their object is to prove the Real Presence and other High Church doctrines. This

is scarcely an honest mode of dealing with the subject, and extremely illogical and illegal. The Papacy is an institution professedly based upon the peculiar authority delivered to S. Peter by the Lord; to ascertain the truth we must first of all learn what S. Peter was, and the nature of that commission which he received from Christ.

Now what did S. Augustine believe S. Peter to be? Was he only an Apostle? Was he nothing more than a Priest, a Bishop, a Pastor? S. Augustine held he was more. He taught (1) that he was the First Apostle. "Who can be ignorant," says he, "that the most blessed Peter is the First of the Apostles?"* (2) that "Peter, on account of the Primacy of his Apostleship, bore a Character which represented the whole Church";† (3) that he "was the Type of the one Church";‡ (4) that "in a Figure he signified the Church";§ (5) that in him "was figured the Unity of all pastors";‖ (6) that he "sustains the Person of this Church Catholic";¶ (7) that he "is the Christian people;"** and (8) that "he received the whole world"?†† And in order to give significance to the office to which the First Apostle was called, he received the name of Rock, *i. e.* Peter, a name he derived from Christ, the True Rock, showing thereby how he was to be

* Opera S. Aug., t. iii. Tract. lvi. in Joan. n. 1.
† *Ib.* Tract. cxxiv. ib. n. 5.
‡ *Ib.* t. v. Sermo lxxvi. in Matt. n. 1. § *Ib.*
‖ *Ib.* Sermo cxlvii. n. 2.
¶ *Ib.* t. vii. de Agone Christiano, n. 32.
** *Ib.* t. v. Sermo lxxvi. n. 1.
†† *Ib.* t. iv. in Ps. ciii. Sermo iii. n. 16.

the Rock to the Church which Christ intended founding and building upon him. Hence, then, S. Peter became the Foundation, the Source, the Representative, the Type, and the Figure of the Catholic Church. But he was more than this: he was himself the "Christian people," "sustaining the very Person of the Church." More, too, even than this was he by direct appointment of the Lord: but this I will discuss presently; enough, however, has been advanced to demonstrate that S. Peter held a position Superior and distinct from that of the other Apostles.

S. Peter, in point of fact, was, under Christ, the common ancestor (so to speak) of the whole Church. He was, in a spiritual sense, to the Catholic Church what Adam was to the human race, Noah to the post-diluvian world, Abraham to all the families of the earth, who should be heirs both of his body and of his faith, and what Jacob or Israel was to the Twelve Tribes, and Judah and David to the holy people. To mark the intention of the Lord, the names of Abram* and Jacob† were changed to signify their relationship to their posterity; and so we find, that when Simon Barjona was elected to become the "great Foundation"‡ and the very "Edifice"§ of the Church, his name, as I have already observed, was changed to Rock, *i. e.* Peter, signifying thereby that he was to be the Rock of the Church—that is, the Rock from the

* Genesis xvii. 5. † *Ib.* xxxii. 28.

‡ Opera Origen., t. ii. Hom. v. in Exod., n. 4.

§ S. James of Nisibis.—Galland., t. v. p. lxxxiv.

Rock, as S. Augustine explains, by which the Church is maintained in perfect unity and strength: "For before," says he, "he was called Simon. Now this name Peter [or Rock] was given him by the Lord, and that too in a figure, that he should signify the Church. For seeing that Christ is the Rock, Peter is the Christian people. For the Rock is the original name. Therefore Peter is so called * [*i. e.* Rock] from

* Most Anglican controversialists maintain that, when our Lord said, "Upon this Rock I will build My Church," He referred not to S. Peter, but to Himself, and they claim S. Augustine as supporting this view. Now, although it is true that this Father held, and rightly so, that Christ is the Rock, yet he does not deny that S. Peter was also the Rock; indeed, he affirms that he was, for he says, "Before, he [Peter] was called Simon. Now that name Petrus, or Rock, *i.e.* Peter, was *given* him by the Lord"; and again, "Peter [or Rock] is *so called* from the Rock," *i.e.* Christ. S. Peter was the Rock, but "so called" from Christ, the proper Rock. It is true S. Augustine distinguishes the two forms of the word as denoting a difference of object; viz. Petrus, the name of Peter, and Petra, the Rock on which the Church was built. And many commentators have made use of S. Augustine's observations on those two forms as a foundation of their opposition to the doctrine of the Papal Supremacy. Valpy, in his Greek Testament, makes the following curious observation: "It is to be observed that τῇ πέτρᾳ, the only foundation or rock, on which the Catholic Church is built, is feminine; but if this latter part of the sentence had been intended to be applied personally to Peter, it would have been, ἐπὶ τούτῳ τῷ πέτρῳ, upon this stone."—(Valpy's Greek Testament, vol. i. p. 115, note. Lond. 1836, 4th edit.) Valpy's argument is that πέτρα, being of the *feminine* gender, cannot refer to Peter, who is, of course, masculine: if Christ meant to found His Church upon Peter, he would have said, ἐπὶ τούτῳ τῷ πέτρῳ, using the masculine form. This is a mistake, for both the LXX. version of the Old Testament and the writers of the New Testament use the feminine form in reference to the Persons of God and of Christ Himself; for example, κύριε πέτρα μου, "O Lord my Rock"

the Rock, not the Rock from Peter; as Christ is not called Christ from the Christian, but the Christian from Christ."* That is to say, that as Christian is derived from Christ, so the Rock Peter from Christ, the true and, *properly speaking*, the only Rock. This is the doctrine of S. Augustine, and he thus continues: "'Therefore,' He saith 'Thou art Peter,' and 'upon this Rock' which thou hast confessed, upon this Rock which thou hast acknowledged, saying, 'Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God, will I build My Church'; that is, upon Myself, the Son of the living God, 'will I build My Church': I will build thee [Peter] upon Myself, not Myself upon thee."†

Anglicans consider that because S. Augustine interprets the "Rock" here to be Christ, he differs from the other Fathers, who assert it to mean S. Peter; but this great Doctor is perfectly accurate from his point of view, and he and the

(2 Sam. xxii. 2); καὶ πέτραν σκανδάλου, "and Rock of scandal," *i. e.* Christ (Rom. ix. 33; see also 1 Pet. ii. 8); Ἡ δὲ πέτρα ἦν ὁ Χριστός, "and the Rock was Christ" (1 Cor. x. 4). It is clear that Valpy and all those who think with him have not understood the construction of biblical Greek, otherwise they would not have made such a mistake concerning this matter. If the Rock on which the Church was to be built was not Peter, then the Rock which followed the Israelites was not Christ, and the Rock of scandal, or offence, did not mean Christ. But inasmuch as S. Paul asserts the Rock in the Wilderness *was* Christ, and S. Peter, that He *is* a Rock of scandal to unbelievers, so it must be concluded that when our Lord said, "Thou art Rock [Peter], and upon this very Rock will I build My Church," He meant—and He could have meant no one else, according to the construction of the language in the Greek Testament—S. Peter himself.

* Opera S. Aug., t. v. Sermo lxxvi. n. 1. † *Ib.*

other Fathers are in perfect accord. What he maintains is this, that S. Peter, as the Representative and as the very "Person of the Church," was himself founded upon Christ the original and true Rock, he himself being built upon Christ, not Christ upon him. Such, then, was S. Peter, the Rock from the Rock, on which he was himself—the very Church itself—founded and built, and hence became related to the whole Church from his time till the second Advent, in the same manner, though spiritually understood, as Abraham to his posterity, Jacob to the Israelites, and Judah and David to the holy people.

But did S. Augustine believe S. Peter to be only a "Figure," or "Type," or "Representative" of the Church? He taught more than this; he taught that S. Peter "held the Princedom of the Apostolate," * and the office of Shepherd of the whole Church, having the charge delivered to him of the one Universal Fold. But in what capacity? Was this office a mere Primacy of courtesy, a mere Primacy among equals, or was it a Primacy of authority and power? It is impossible to doubt what S. Augustine held it to be. He believed S. Peter to be the "Alter Ego" of Christ Himself. He believed S. Peter was, as we describe him in modern language, the Vicar of Christ, invested with all those royal powers, which appertained to our Lord, as the Head and High-priest of the Household of God. This is most evident from the following passage. Commenting on

* Opera S. Aug., t. v. Sermo lxxvi. in Matt. n. 3.

the words, "Simon, son of Jonas, lovest thou Me?" "Feed My Lambs," "Feed My Sheep," he says, "... Now also Peter himself He [Christ] willed to constitute one with Himself, to whom, as His Other Self" ("Alter Alteri," the ecclesiastical form of expression for the classical Alter Ego), "He commended His Sheep ... that he might be the Head, that he might carry the Figure of His Body, *i.e.* the Church, even as a bridegroom and bride are two in one flesh. Hence, that He might commend His Sheep, what does He say to him first, in order that He might commend as to another (*i.e.* to his Other Self), 'Peter, lovest thou Me?' &c. &c. He confirms love that He might consolidate unity."* In this explicit statement we note the following points: (1) that it was the will of Christ that one of the Twelve should be appointed to be His special Vicar or Representative, even "His OTHER SELF," whose duty would be to take the place of Christ, as the One Shepherd of the One Universal Fold, when He should finally depart from this world to the right hand of the Father; (2) that his relationship to Christ should be of a most peculiar and intimate kind, differing materially from that of an ordinary ambassador of a king, being similar in kind, only, of course, spiritually discerned, to that of a husband and wife, that is, sacramentally, "two in one flesh." Christ, then, and Peter are represented by S. Augustine as Both ONE, the former being the Bridegroom, the latter the Church, which is the Bride; for, as as S. Augustine said, "in whom alone the Lord

* *Ib.* t. v. Sermo xlvi. n. 30.

formed the Church";* and hence he was "the Christian people," the very "Person of the Church"; and (3) that S. Peter was to be the Head of the Body in the place Christ filled when upon earth.

It is impossible to doubt, then, what S. Augustine understood S. Peter's position to be. He held he was our Lord's Vicar and Representative, invested with all those powers and prerogatives which appertained to Christ as the Son of Man, that is, as King of kings and Lord of lords, and as High-priest of the Household of God. Such is the Sovereign power involved in the office of the Alter Ego, or, to use the ecclesiastical form, the "Alter Alteri" of our Lord, which may be summed up in the terms of the commission delivered to Peter alone, and exclusively of the other Apostles: "Thou art Rock [Peter], and upon this very Rock will I build My Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it; and I will give unto thee the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven";† "Confirm thy Brethren";‡ "Feed My Lambs"; "Feed My Sheep"; "Feed My Sheep."§ S. Peter, then, was the "Alter Alteri" of Christ our Lord, His own special Vicar, invested with the fulness of His jurisdiction, having power, by his own single authority, to Judge, to Teach, and to Feed the Universal Church—Apostles, pastors,

* Opera S. Aug., t. v. Sermo cxxxvii. n. 3.
† S. Matt. xvi. 18, 19. ‡ S. Luke xxii. 32.
§ S. John xxi. 15–17.

kings, and people, for all are committed to him, having, as S. Augustine says, "received the whole world."*

2. Such was S. Augustine's doctrine touching the position of S. Peter in the hierarchy of the Catholic Church. Did this illustrious Father believe that the Bishop of Rome, as Successor to S. Peter, was, equally with him, the Vicar of Christ, that is, His "Alter Alteri," possessing all his royal and priestly Prerogatives? The Reviewer in the *Guardian* denies this fact. He says, adopting the words of Janus, "Yet from all his numerous works, filling ten folios, only one sentence, in one letter, can be quoted, where he says that the principality of the Apostolic chair has always been in Rome."

Let us see whether he is correct: I do not mean the *ipsissima verba* above referred to, but the *thing itself*, that is, the Supreme office of the Papacy in the Church Catholic. I will commence with the passage quoted by the *Guardian* from Janus. This passage is misquoted; a most important word, which gives force and effect to S. Augustine's meaning, has been omitted; why, is best known to my Reviewer and his nameless ally. And besides, the passage is so separated from its context and following sentence, as to completely conceal the point of S. Augustine's observation: "That city [Carthage] had a bishop of no slight authority, who was able not to heed the multitude of enemies conspiring against him, when he saw himself united by Letters of communion, both with the Roman

* Opera S. Aug., t. iv. in Psal. ciii. Serm. iii. n. 16.

Church, in which the Princedom of the Apostolic Chair has at all times been in force, and with other lands, whence the Gospel came into Africa itself, where he might be ready to plead his own cause if his adversaries should attempt to alienate those Churches from him."*

Such is the passage which is distorted by my Reviewer and his ally, Janus. The principal word, the verb, "in-force" (viguit), is omitted in their quotation; so, instead of the passage being, "the principality of the Apostolic Chair has always been in Rome," it ought to have been as above, "in which [*i. e.* the Roman Church] the Princedom of the Apostolic Chair has at all times been in force";† that is, its authority has always been in active operation in the government of the Church and in the settlement of disputes. But they have taken another liberty with the passage; they have so quoted it as to make it appear of no weight as a distinct testimony in favour of the Supremacy of the Holy See.

It will be admitted that the insertion of a parenthesis in the middle of a sentence, not absolutely necessary, is, as a rule, intended to give it a force and a significancy which it would not otherwise possess. For instance, if S. Augustine had written, ". . . . Letters of communion, both with the Roman Church and with other lands," no

* Opera S. Aug., t. ii. Ep. xliii. Glorio et aliis Donat., n. 7.

† "Viguit," the verb my Reviewer and Janus omitted, signifies, to be in vigour, or in active force; so that the passage means that the Princedom of the Apostolic Chair had been at all times, in every age, a living reality, in full vigour, in full operation.

exclusive interpretation need necessarily be applied to the words "the Roman Church," beyond the implication of the fact of her being a Church of renown. But the parenthesis fixes dogmatically the object of S. Augustine in mentioning the Roman Church, in contradistinction to the Churches in "other lands." "When he [the Bishop of Carthage] saw himself united by Letters of communion with both the Roman Church, IN WHICH THE PRINCEDOM OF THE APOSTOLIC CHAIR HAS AT ALL TIMES * BEEN IN FORCE, and with other lands"; that is to say, "Letters of communion, first with the Roman Church," which Church, by virtue of her foundation, and of the commission delivered to S. Peter, her first Bishop, as the Vicar and "Alter Alteri" of Christ our Lord, possessing the Supreme jurisdiction over the whole Church, communion with which is necessary before admission into the communion of the Churches in "other lands."

The strength, then, of the Bishop of Carthage's position against his opponents consisted in his being in the first instance in union with the governing Church, the mother and mistress of all Churches, and then with the Churches in other parts of the world. That this must have been S. Augustine's meaning, is evident from a passage in another part of his works, where he says, "The

* The Latin word *semper*, it should be remembered, is a word of precision, indicating "either uninterrupted or unending duration; in the former case having reference to past or present time in the latter, to the future: it also denotes uniform repetition or recurrence—*ever, always, at all times, for ever.*"—Smith's Lat. Dict.

Eastern heresy endeavoured to unite itself with that of Africa. This is the more evident, because no Eastern Catholic ever communicated by letters with the Bishop of Carthage except through the Bishop of Rome."* And the reason was this, because Rome was the centre of authority, wherein was "the Principal Church," "the Chair of Peter," the Princedom of which had "at all times been in force," and the Source of unity, without adhesion to which no letters of communion can have any effect. The words, then, so grossly misquoted by the *Guardian* really mean, that the Chair of Peter at Rome possessed Supreme authority, to which the Bishop of Carthage deferred, and through which he was in communion with the Churches in "other lands," and they with him.

3. Before I pass on, let me dispose of the addendum the *Guardian* and Janus have gratuitously added to the words, "the Principality of the Apostolic Chair has always been in Rome," "which could, of course, be said then with equal truth of Antioch, Jerusalem, and Alexandria." In the whole range of the works of the Fathers I do not believe that the words, "Principality of the Apostolic Chair," were ever applied to any other Apostolic Chair than that of Rome. We read of the Apostolic Sees, the Chairs of the Apostles, the Apostolic See of this or that Apostle; but never the words, "THE APOSTOLIC SEE," or "the Sacerdotal Chair," or "the Principality of the Apostolic See," as referring to Antioch, or Jerusalem, or

* Opera S. Aug., t. ix. cont. Crescon. Donat., l. iii. n. 38.

Alexandria, but only and exclusively to the See of Peter at Rome. If I am mistaken, my Reviewer will doubtless point it out, but I believe he cannot. If this is true, the addendum above quoted is simply a gratuitous assumption, devoid of any foundation whatsoever.

But I will admit, for the sake of argument, that other Apostolic Sees have been similarly described. What then? Did S. Augustine use the words, "in which [Rome] the Princedom of the Apostolic Chair has at all times been in force," in a general or restricted sense? The whole passage, as I have shown, clearly indicates that he meant to refer to the Roman Church, as the Supreme Church, communion with which was necessary before communion with the Church in other parts of the world. I need not recapitulate this point, for it is self-evident; but there is a little word inserted in this addendum on which I must say a few words, and on which I shall hinge what I have yet to say.

The *Guardian* says, "which, of course, could be said THEN with equal truth of Antioch, Jerusalem, and Alexandria." I venture to assert this is untrue,—first, as respects the tradition of the whole Church, and that which S. Augustine had received and handed down.

In dealing in matters of controversy, primarily with the Donatists, but secondarily, by implication, with all forms of error, S. Augustine lays down this most important rule respecting the tradition of Truth. He says: "For if the order of bishops succeeding to each other is to be

considered, how much more surely, and truly healthfully, do we reckon from Peter himself, to whom, bearing a figure of the whole Church, the Lord says, 'Upon this Rock will I build My Church, and the gates of hell shall not overcome it.' For to Peter succeeded Linus; to Linus, Clement; to Clement, Anacletus" (and so on, giving the names of the Pontiffs till his time); ". . . . to Damasus, Siricius; to Siricius, Anastasius. In this order of succession no Donatist Bishop is found, . . . and even though any betrayer had crept in during those times into that order of Bishops which extends from Peter to Anastasius, who now sits in that same Chair, he would nowise create a plea against the Church and innocent Christians, for whom the Lord, providing, says of evil rulers, 'Whatsoever they shall say, do; but what they do, do not; for they say and do not.'"* Why does S. Augustine recommend reference to the "Apostolic See" of Peter, rather than to other Apostolic Sees? Because to do so is "more *sure and truly healthful*"; that is his expressed reason. But why "more *sure and truly healthful*," when all the Apostolic Sees had received the same deposit? The answer is given in the previous extract, viz. because in Rome "the Princedom of the Apostolic Chair has at all times been in force." Other passages which I shall quote will confirm this point.

According to S. Augustine, it is S. Peter and his Successors to his Roman Chair that possess the Chiefdom respecting the Tradition of Truth,

* Opera S. Aug., t. ii. Ep. liii. Generoso, n. 2, 3.

which all the Apostles equally received, but which was more potently guarded in the Person and Chair of Peter. S. Peter bore a character representing the whole Church. To him alone our Lord said, "Upon this Rock I will build My Church, and the gates of hell shall not overcome it"; that is, the Church built not upon the Apostolic Sees in general, but upon *the* Apostolic See, the Apostolic See of Peter, to whom succeeded Linus, Clement, Anacletus, &c. &c., *down* to Anastasius, who sat in the Apostolic Chair in the time of S. Augustine. Hence it was that it was "more sure and truly healthful" to refer to Rome for the solution of doctrinal questions than to any other Apostolic See, because the Roman See was the See of Peter, to whom the Lord said, "Upon this Rock will I build My Church, and the gates of hell shall not overcome it," and in which See "the Princedom of the Apostolic See has at all times been in force."

S. Augustine confirms this interpretation of his testimony in many letters which he addressed to the Pontiff and others. For example: in one addressed to Sixtus, afterwards Pope, he says, "Some of these men [Pelagians], before this pestilence was condemned by the most manifest Judgment of the Apostolic See, might have become known to you, but whom you may now see of a sudden silent."* Why so suddenly silent? The next extract will give the answer: "For already on this cause [Pelagianism] the decisions of two Councils have

* *Ib.* t. ii. Ep. cxci. Sixto, n. 2.

been forwarded to the Apostolic See; thence also rescripts have come. The cause is ended; would that at length the error may end."* Here we have an insight into the law of councils, to which the Reviewer refers in the following passage:—"Let us suppose that those Bishops who judged the case at Rome were not good Bishops: *there remained still a plenary Council of the universal Church*, where the cause, and even its actual judges (*etiam cum ipsis judicibus causa*), could be discussed, so that, if they had been convicted of having judged badly, their decisions might be annulled (*eorum sententiæ solverentur*).—Epistola xliii. sec. 19 (ed. Ben.)."† This extract is taken from the same Epistle to Glorius and other Donatists, which I quoted above, and which contains those remarkable words concerning the Authority of the Apostolic See.

Now when S. Augustine spoke of referring the Donatist controversy to a General Council, did he mean to imply there was an appeal from the Pope to the Universal Episcopate? There is no evidence whatever that he meant this. If he did, then he would have contradicted what he has in several places written concerning the position of the Roman Church. What, then, did he mean? This may be explained by the previous extract I have referred to: "For already, on this cause, the decisions of two Councils have been forwarded to the Apostolic See; thence also rescripts

* Opera S. Aug., t. v. Serm. cxxxi. de Verb. Evang. Joan. vi. n. 10.

† The *Guardian*, Aug. 31, 1870.

have come. The cause is ended: would that the error may end." Now what was the authority that determined the question? Was it a council merely? Certainly not, for a council can have no binding effect on the Faithful without the approval of the Holy See.* And the above proves this fact clearly. Two Councils were held in Africa on the error of Pelagius, the acts were forwarded to Rome and answers returned, and *then* it was, and not till then, that "the cause was ended," that is, it was ended by means of the Decree of the Holy See confirming the acts of these Councils.

This is evidently so, for S. Augustine, in explaining how a cause is terminated by the Apostolic See, says, in one of his epistles, "doubts were determined respecting these matters by the Letters of Innocent of blessed memory."† It is true that before the Pope takes action on any matter he generally consults his Council, and sometimes it happens that a larger council is needed to determine great causes which trouble the Church, and then others are convoked, and perhaps an Œcumenical one is necessary, in order to enable the Church to get rid more effectually of some heresy or scandal; but it is always the decree of the Pope that gives to these Councils their force and effect. The *Guardian*, then, was in error in supposing that when S. Augustine wrote, "there remained still a

* "It is a sacerdotal law that the things done contrary to the decree of the Bishop of the Romans be regarded as null."—Soz. H. E., l. iii. c. 10.

† Opera S. Aug., t. x. Contr. duas Ep. Pelag., l. ii. n. 5.

plenary council of the Universal Church, when the cause, and even its actual judges, could be discussed, so that, if they had been convicted of having judged badly, their decisions might be annulled," he intended to say that there was an appeal from the Pope in provincial council to the Pope in General or Œcumenical council; for he distinctly says, but on the return of the rescripts from Rome "the cause was ended," and that it was terminated by "his Letter."

There are other passages which confirm this position. "What could be more clear and explicit than that decision of the Apostolic See?"* "What says the ungrateful man to those things, whom, as if by his own confession punished, the Apostolic See spared with most indulgent lenity?"† "My desire is to agitate the matter in our own Council, and, if need be, to write to the Apostolic See."‡ "We have examples, the Apostolic See itself judging or confirming the judgments of others."§ These extracts confirm the position of the Pope in relation to all other bishops, whether gathered in council or not. His plenary power of condemning heresies and heretics is admitted by S. Augustine; and he hints at the Superiority of the Pope to a council when he expresses a desire to agitate a certain matter in an African council, but if necessary to refer it to the Apostolic See, for solution; recognizing thereby the Pope's Prerogative

* Opera S. Aug., t. x. Contr. duas Ep. Pelag., l. ii. n. 6.
† *Ib.* n. 7. ‡ *Ib.* Ex Epist. ad Classicam.
§ *Ib.* t. ii. Ep. ccix. ad Cœlestin., n. 8.

of himself judging, and also of confirming the judgment of others. And why so? Because he regarded the Pope as Superior to all other bishops. In his letter to Pope S. Boniface he says, "As there is one common function to all of us who discharge the episcopal office, albeit you are yourself pre-eminent in it by a Higher Grade. . . ."* It is manifest, then, that S. Augustine regarded the Pope as the Supreme authority in the Catholic Church, to whom every bishop, himself included, was bound to defer.

4. But there are one or two most important passages I have reserved for the last, which dispose, I think, of the strictures of the *Guardian*. To the question, What keeps me in the Catholic Church? S. Augustine gives several very definite and conclusive answers, which I endeavoured to explain in my late work, but which all my Reviewers, the *Guardian* included, passed over in silence. One answer given by S. Augustine determines this point so conclusively, that it is really unnecessary to refer the reader to any other passage of his except by way of illustration. He says, ". . . . The succession of Bishops from the *Chair itself* (Cathedra ipsa Petri) of Peter, to whom the Lord, after His Resurrection, committed His sheep to be fed, down even to the present Bishop, keeps me"† in the Catholic Church. In this passage there are three salient points: (1) the Chair itself of Peter; (2) the commission granted

* *Ib.* t. x. Contr. duas Ep. Pelag., l. i. n. 2.

† *Ib.* t. viii. Cont. Ep. Manich. Fundam., n. 5.

to that Chair and its first occupant, S. Peter; and (3) the succession of Bishops in that same Chair, *down* even to the Bishop who presided therein in S. Augustine's time. It has already been pointed out what S. Augustine had written touching S. Peter's office; how he had asserted (1) that he was the Representative, the Figure, and the Person of the Church; and (2) that he was the "Alter Alteri," that is, the "Other Self" of the Lord Jesus Christ, being united with Him in office and jurisdiction of so close and intimate a nature as to be One, "even as a husband and wife are two in one flesh." In a word, that S. Peter was the Vicar of Christ, His Representative and Lieutenant, and also the very "Person of the Church Catholic."

Now the real point at issue is this, Did the Successors of S. Peter to his Chair succeed him in his Prerogatives as the "Alter Alteri," *i. e.* "the Other Self," or "Vicar of Christ," "to whom [Peter] was committed the Sheep to be fed"? S. Augustine clearly believed that such was the case. What keeps me in the Catholic Church? "The Succession of Bishops from the CHAIR ITSELF OF PETER, *down* even to the present Bishop, keeps me." The Chair, like the throne in any kingdom, is the symbol of Supreme jurisdiction, authority, and power, to which are attached in perpetuity the Prerogatives originally delivered to it. To that Chair was attached the Prerogative of the Rock, by which it should ever be in all times the solid foundation of the Faith, the enduring strength of the Faithful, and the ever-standing Pillar and Stay of the Truth, in the power of which, and by the

authority of which, he who sits therein possesses inherently in himself the function of the Supreme Judge over all matters subject to the jurisdiction of the Keys, of Supreme Teacher of dogma (for to him is committed the office of confirming the Brethren), and that of the Supreme Pastor of the one Fold, which he is commissioned to feed and guard. This is the office of the "Chair itself of Peter," who received these high Prerogatives as the "Other Self" of Christ, and which are for ever attached to that Chair; for S. Augustine said in the above passage, "The succession of Bishops from the Chair *itself* of Peter, . . . *down* even to the present Bishop, keeps me" in the Catholic Church.

It is clear, then, to demonstration that the "Chair itself" represented S. Peter *for all time*, and that it included within itself (as all kingly thrones do), in perpetuity, all those Prerogatives alluded to above. In a word, S. Augustine held that the Chair of Peter was for all time the Rock of the Church; for he thus writes: "Enumerate the Priests [*i. e.* Bishops], even from the See itself of Peter, and in that order of Fathers observe who succeeded to each other; this is the Rock which the proud gates of hell cannot overcome."* The Rock is the See or Chair of Peter at Rome, represented from age to age by the succession of Pontiffs, "*down* even to the present Bishop." Can there be any reasonable doubt that S. Augustine held, that one of the main reasons that kept him in the

* Opera S. Aug., t. ix. Ps. in Part. Donat.

Church was the presence of the "Chair itself" of Peter, to whom the Lord, after His resurrection, committed His Sheep to be fed, down even to the present Bishop," and this because he believed that that Chair was the "Rock," against which the gates of hell cannot prevail? It was this that kept him a Catholic, because he knew well that to S. Peter was committed the office of Vicar of Christ, the "Alter Alteri"; and that the Chair, together with him and his Successors to that Chair, constituted that Rock which was both indefectible and infallible.

5. But, perhaps, my Reviewer will assert that this Chair need not necessarily signify the Roman Chair, but the Chair of Peter at Antioch, and his Chair of Alexandria, in which S. Mark sat by delegation. This objection is easily disposed of. S. Augustine, no doubt, says elsewhere in his works, and Anglicans are fond of reminding us of it, that all the Apostles shared in common with S. Peter the power of the Apostolate, and hence that they all had chairs, and all were rocks. This is perfectly true, and no Catholic denies it; the only difference between S. Peter and the other Apostles was (1) that he received "*alone*" what all the rest received together in common with himself; and (2) that he was invested by the Lord with the Supreme jurisdiction, as is clearly enunciated in the Gospels, in those passages so often referred to, but which Anglicans doggedly refuse to interpret according to their natural and evident sense. Now, in the two passages above quoted, S. Augustine does not speak of many chairs or many rocks,

or of the two chairs of Antioch and Alexandria, but he speaks of *one* only, viz. the "Chair ITSELF" and the "Rock," which he regards as possessing such overwhelming authority as sufficing to keep him in the Catholic Church. But to which of the three Chairs—of Rome, Antioch, or Alexandria—does he allude? Clearly to that of the Roman Church, as the following extract, already quoted, undoubtedly shows: "For if the order of bishops succeeding each other is to be considered, how much more surely and truly healthfully do we reckon from Peter, to whom, bearing a figure of the whole Church, the Lord said, 'Upon this Rock will I build My Church, and the gates of hell shall not overcome it.' For to Peter succeeded Linus; to Linus, Clement," &c. &c. (enumerating the names of S. Peter's Successors to his Chair); "to Siricius, Anastasius . . . who now sits in that same Chair"—of Peter.* Therefore S. Augustine meant the Roman Chair, and Peter and his Successors to that Chair, "*down* even to the present Bishop," who sits in the "Chair *itself* of Peter," which is "the Rock" of the Catholic Church, against which Rock "the proud gates of hell shall not prevail."

That S. Augustine really believed in the absolute Supremacy of the "Chair itself" of S. Peter is evident from another passage which I shall now adduce. "When, therefore," says he, "we see so much help from God, and so much progress and fruit, shall we hesitate to hide ourselves in the

* Opera S. Aug., t. ii. Ep. liii. Generoso, n. 2, 3.

bosom of that Church [*i. e.* the Roman] which even by the acknowledgment of the human race, by reason of the Apostolic See through the Succession of Bishops—heretics, condemned, partly by the very people, partly by the weight of Councils, partly also by the majesty of miracles, in vain raging all around [against it]—has held the Summit of Authority"? To be unwilling to yield to her the Chief [primas] Place, is surely, either the height of impiety or headlong presumption."*

In this passage S. Augustine asserts (1) the duty of recourse to "the Apostolic See"; (2) the fact that that See has held the "SUMMIT OF AUTHORITY," and that, too, by "the acknowledgment of the human race"; and (3) the fact that, not to yield to that Authority, which possesses the Chief Place, is the "height of impiety" and "headlong presumption." Why so? Because by the divine commission delivered to S. Peter by Christ as his "Other Self," he was constituted to be the Rock, the Judge, the Teacher, and the Feeder of the Flock; which offices were transmitted to his Successors, "down even to the present Bishop": each of whom in his day, when sitting in the Apostolic See, is in possession of "the Summit of Authority," to refuse to yield to which Authority, S. Augustine says, is "either the height of impiety or headlong presumption."

Now these are master-passages which nothing S. Augustine may have said elsewhere in his voluminous works can modify. They speak for

* Opera S. Aug., t. viii. De Util., n. 35.

themselves in language so clear and definite, that the marvel is how any one can misunderstand them. We have seen what he said about S. Peter's office as the "Other Self" of Christ, an expression synonymous with what fell from S. Ambrose, who styled S. Peter "the Vicar of His own love";* from S. Ephrem, who said that "he obtained the Place of the Head";† and S. Peter Chrysologus, who declared that to S. Peter was committed the feeding of the Sheep "in His Stead,"‡ that is, in the stead of Christ. And we have also observed how plainly S. Augustine stated the fact that the "Chair itself," as being the "Rock," was of sufficient authority, nay more, of paramount authority, to keep him in the Catholic Church, because it was the "Summit of Authority," the refusal to recognize which was, in his estimation, "the height of impiety" and "headlong presumption."

It is simply idle to produce passages in which he speaks of appealing from one Council to a larger one, or even to a universal Council, for here we have his plain statements concerning (1) the position of S. Peter in the Apostolic College, and (2) of that of the Supreme Pontiff (the "Summit of Authority") in the hierarchy of the Catholic Church. And equally absurd is it for the Reviewer in the *Guardian*, by the mouth of

* Opera S. Amb., t. i. in Luc. l. x. n. 175.

† Opera S. Ephrem, t. i. Asseman., Bibl. Orient., p. 95. Rome, 1732.

‡ Opera S. Petri Chrysol., Serm. vi. in Psl. xcix. p. 10 Colon. 1627.

Janus, to make the gratuitous assumption, that when S. Augustine spoke of the "Princedom of the Apostolic Chair as having always been in Rome" (and let me add what he omitted, "has at all times been *in force*"), the same might "*then* be said with equal truth of Antioch, Jerusalem, and Alexandria." I have no other words to say in answer to this assumption than that it is simply untrue. There is not a vestige of proof in S. Augustine's works, or in those of any other Father, or in the acts and decrees of Plenary and Œcumenical Councils, of any such recognition of the claims of the other Apostolic Sees in any part of the world. I have further shown that S. Augustine gave a practical illustration of what he understood to be the nature of the Papal authority, when he obeyed a command from the Pope to go to Mauritania Cæsariensis to quell the Donatist schism, which command he certainly would never have obeyed if the Pope had not been regarded by this Father as "the Summit of Authority" in the Catholic Church, obedience to which was obligatory.

But S. Augustine gave two other practical illustrations of his belief in the Papal authority. He was present in the two Councils of Carthage and Milevis (A.D. 416), when synodical letters were addressed to the Pope, said to have been prepared by him, of which the following are extracts:— "These proceedings of ours [at Carthage], my Lord and Brother, we have thought should be made known to your charity, that to the ordinances of our lowliness may be applied the

Authority of the Apostolic See for the defence of the salvation of many, and likewise for the correction of the perversity of some."* Again, "As the Lord, by the sovereign gift of His own grace, has placed you in the Apostolic See, and has furnished these times with such an one that it will rather be a proof against us of the guilt of negligence, if we omitted to name to your veneration the things that are to be suggested for the good of the Church, than possible for you either to receive these suggestions fastidiously or negligently; we beseech you that you would vouchsafe to apply your pastoral diligence to the great dangers of the infirm members of Christ, for a new heresy, and one exceedingly pernicious, that of the enemies of the grace of Christ, is endeavouring to rise up. . . . But we think that by the assistance of the mercy of God, who will vouchsafe to guide your deliberations and hear your prayers, they who hold opinions so perverse and pernicious will more readily yield to the Authority of your Holiness, derived as it is from the authority of the Holy Scriptures."†

Here we have the meaning of S. Augustine indelibly fixed, and we also have an explanation of the relationship between the Pope and the Council. The synodical epistle of the Council of Carthage requests the Pope (1) to confirm its decrees by "applying to them the Authority of the Apostolic

* Opera S. Aug., t. ii. Ep. clxxv. Synod. Concil. Carthag. ad Innocent., n. 1.

† *Ib.* t. ii. Ep. clxxvi. ad Innocent. Synod. Milevit.

See," that is, the "Summit of Authority," to which all must have recourse, as holding the Chief Place in the Catholic hierarchy, to refuse to yield to which is the "height of impiety" and "headlong presumption"; (2) to confirm these decrees for (*a*) "the defence of the salvation of many" and (*b*) for "the correction of the perversity of some." Here we perceive the fulness of the Papal jurisdiction acknowledged, for the Fathers of this Council, and S. Augustine among them, ask the Pope to exercise his power, in order that men might be saved from error and eternal ruin, and that those who had imperilled their salvation might be corrected, that is, censured or excommunicated. The Council of Milevis, in which S. Augustine took part, is equally, indeed more, explicit in this recognition of the Authority of the Roman Bishop, for they urge him —(1) "to apply his pastoral diligence to the great danger of the infirm members of the Church;" (2) to exercise his Apostolic power, which they say is "derived from the authority of the Holy Scriptures." S. Augustine, then, and the Fathers of those two Councils admitted the Authority of the Pope over the whole Church to be not human, not ecclesiastical in its origin, but *divine*, as derived from "the authority of the holy Scriptures," that is, from those great passages so often quoted, which affirm that S. Peter was appointed to be the Rock, the Supreme Judge, the Teacher, and the Shepherd of the entire Fold.

These synodical letters throw light, then, upon the language of S. Augustine concerning the condemnation of heretics "by Councils," and by

"the venerable Prelate of the Apostolic Sec." As I have shown above, all councils, provincial, general, and œcumenical, specially where doctrine is concerned, require the confirmation of the Holy See before the decree can become binding on the Faithful. The two Councils held in Africa, the synodical epistle of which I have been discussing, could not have taken effect without reference to Rome; and further, the instant they received the confirmation of the Supreme Pontiff they became binding on the conscience of all. In one of his sermons which I have quoted above, S. Augustine said, "For already on this cause the decisions of two Councils have been sent to the Apostolic See, thence also rescripts have been returned; the cause is ended; would that at length the error might cease."

It would be well to examine the form of the sentence of the Supreme Pontiff contained in one of these rescripts, to which S. Augustine referred: ". . . For the authors of these evils must needs be more cautious on seeing themselves, upon the report of two synods, separated from the communion of the Church by the DECREE OF OUR SENTENCE. . . . Wherefore we do, by the Authority of the Apostolic Power, declare Cœlestius and Pelagius, the inventors, that is, of novel words, . . . deprived of the communion of the Church."* What do we learn here respecting Councils and their powers? We learn from this rescript of the Pope, which S. Augustine did not reject, but accept, that

* Galland., t. viii. pp. 602, 603.

Councils are in point of fact the assessors of the Pope, who report to him their proceedings, and, as he deems best, either confirms or rejects their decrees. And this is what S. Augustine means when he says, "The cause is ended," that is, the Apostolic See has judged, after considering the decrees of these two Councils. I am aware that the *Guardian* will remind me of another Council of Carthage, which rejected the Pope's claim to receive appeals or causes of mere discipline and privilege; but this is not a case in point. The African Fathers admitted the Papal jurisdiction respecting the doctrine of Faith, as we have seen; what they disapproved of was the appeal of a priest to the Court of Rome, who had been convicted of shameful immorality, and the claim to receive such appeals from the provinces. This point was examined in the work my Criticisers pretended to review, and, according to their usual custom respecting knotty points, by them ignored.

I think enough has been said to dispose of the assertion of the *Guardian*, that "from all his numerous works, filling ten folios, only one sentence, in one letter, can be quoted, where he says that the principality of the Apostolic chair has always been in Rome, which could, of course, be said then with equal truth of Antioch, Jerusalem, and Alexandria." The dignity of S. Peter as the "Other Self of Christ," the office he held as the Feeder and Shepherd of the one Fold, and the continuation of this dignity and office in the Successors to the Roman "Chair itself of Peter,"—that is, the "Rock" of the Catholic Church, "the

Summit of Authority," holding the "Chief Place" in the Catholic hierarchy,—scatter to the winds those words of Janus, adopted, *unconsciously*, I trust, by the *Guardian*.

But before concluding, it is necessary to comment upon two extracts given by the Reviewer in the *Guardian*, which indicate how utterly incapable he is of comprehending, or rather of distinguishing, the *office* from the *person* himself. He quotes two passages from S. Augustine to show the non-importance to the Church of the *personal* orthodoxy of certain Metropolitans, as "exhibited in the well-known words" of this Father:—"'Let Marcellinus, Marcellus, Silvester, Melchiades [all Bishops of Rome], Mensurius, Cæcilian [Bishops of Carthage], have been what they will, and others to whom they [the Donatists] make their wilful objections on behalf of their own dissension, this in no way injures the Catholic Church diffused through the whole world; in no wise are we crowned by their innocence, in no wise are condemned by their iniquity.'—De unico Baptismo, cont. Donatistas, cap. xvi."* And he "subjoins" another "parallel passage":—"'In this order of succession [of the Bishops of Rome] no Donatist Bishop is to be found. But even if any traitor had crept into that line of Bishops which is continued from Peter to Anastasius, who now holds the same seat, this would prove no injury to the Church and innocent Christians.'—Epistola liii. (ed. Ben.)."

Who among the so-called "Ultramontanists"

* The *Guardian*, Aug. 31, 1870.

and the so-called "Infallibilists" has ever said that our salvation or damnation depended upon the "innocence" or the "iniquity" of the Popes? Anglicans seem to think that Catholics believe the Pope to be a sort of god or angel, who is superior to mortality, free from all sin, and under all circumstances infallible in the exercise of his high office. This is the fundamental error of Anglicans, and it is necessary to repeat over and over again *ad nauseam* that the Pope is a man like all other men, liable to fall into mortal sin, liable to be guilty of heresy, and to compromise the Church by such a maladministration of his government as to injure for a time her great work on earth. With respect to his infallibility, it is only under certain special circumstances that he is infallible, and that is when he defines a dogma from the Chair of Peter (*i. e. ex cathedra*), binding the Faithful to accept his definition under penalty of anathema. Then only is he infallible; but when he acts as teacher of the Church, short of pronouncing *ex cathedra*, he is as fallible as any other man, and may be resisted by any bishop of the Church.

Now is this the view of S. Augustine? If the *Guardian* had given the full extract from this Father, it would have been perceived how carefully he drew the distinction between the *person* and the *office* the Pope holds as Teacher: "But even if any traitor had crept into that line of Bishops which is continued from Peter to Anastasius, who now holds the same seat, this would prove no injury to the Church and innocent Christians, *for whom the Lord providing says of*

evil rulers, 'Whatsoever they shall say, do; but what they do, do not; for they say and do not.'" The clause in italics is what the *Guardian* has omitted, and it is the key to this Father's meaning. A Pope may be a bad man, he may inflict unspeakable injury on the Church by dereliction of duty, by writing heretical works, &c.; but when "he says," that is, when he teaches from his Seat of authority, then is he to be obeyed. "Whatsoever they shall say," *i.e.* command, "do," that is, obey; but "what they do," that is, their evil deeds, "do not." It is clear what S. Augustine means; that if, perchance, there should have been in the list of Pontiffs some who favoured the Donatist schism, then follow not their conduct, but recollect, whatsoever they may have commanded, that is to be obeyed.

In another place S. Augustine enlarges on this point; in answer to the slander of the Donatists, he replies:—". . . What has the Chair of the Roman Church in which Peter sat, and in which Anastasius now sits, done to you; or the [chair] of Jerusalem in which James sat, and John now sits; by which we are knit together in Catholic unity, and from which, in guilty frenzy you have separated? Why call you the Apostolic Chair* 'a

* Some translate "*an* apostolic chair," because the (chair) of Jerusalem is mentioned with that of the Chair of Rome. It seems to me, however, that there are good reasons for rendering it "*the* Apostolic Chair": (1) because Petilianus evidently alludes to the Roman Chair as "the chair of pestilence"; (2) because the comparison drawn from the chair of Moses by S. Augustine would lose its point if it did not refer exclusively to the Chair of Peter; (3) because, according to the doctrine as laid down by S. Cyprian and S. Optatus Milevi, there is in the Church but one only Chair,

chair of pestilence'? If, on account of men who, you think, speak the law and do it not; did our Lord Jesus Christ, on account of the Pharisees, of whom He said, 'For they say and do not,' utter any injurious words against the chair in which they sat? Did he not commend that chair of Moses, and, saving the honour of the chair, reprove them? For he says, 'They sit in the chair of Moses: whatsoever they say, do; but what they do, do not; for they say and do not.' If you had thought of these things, you would not, on account of the men whom you defame, blaspheme against the Apostolic Chair, with which you communicate not."*

It is very plain what S. Augustine means. "The chair" is a symbol, it is a thing inanimate; and it of itself cannot speak, cannot teach, cannot command. Nevertheless it does speak, teach, and

even the Chair of Peter at Rome, all other chairs being in union with, and subject to it. This is evident from what S. Optatus says: ". . . . On Peter first was the episcopal Chair conferred, wherein might sit Peter, the Head of all the Apostles, . . . so that in that one Single Chair unity might be preserved by all"; and then he further says, "Neither did the other Apostles each contend for a distinct Chair for himself," and on this ground, "that whosoever should set up another chair in opposition to the Single Chair might at once [be known] as a schismatic and a sinner"; and to show how that Single Chair still exists, S. Optatus says, "Peter then filled that Single Chair, which is the first note of the Church; to him succeeded Linus; to Linus, Clement; . . . to Damasus, Siricius, who is now our colleague" (De Schism., l. ii. c. 1); and (4) because S. Augustine himself, as shown in the text (p. 145), declares that "the Chair itself of Peter" is "the Rock which the proud gates of hell overcome not."

* Opera S. Aug., t. ix. cont. Litteras Petil., l. ii. n. 118.

command. How? By the person who owns the chair, and the authority which is inherent in such chair speaks, teaches, and commands. That is what is meant by the term *ex cathedra*. Christ said to the people, "They sit in the chair of Moses; whatsoever, *therefore*, they say, do"; that is, what they say *ex cathedra*, that do ye adhere to, because it is the command of authority. The person, when *sitting there* and exercising the office of the chair, is to be obeyed; but he adds, "what they do, do ye not"; *i. e.* follow not them in their evil deeds, in their blasphemies, and in their false opinions. Apply this, as S. Augustine intended, to the Chair of Rome and the chair of Jerusalem; obey him who speaks, teaches, and commands *ex cathedra*, *i.e.* from the Chair, and by the authority of the Chair: but his conduct, if reprehensible, repudiate; for when he speaks and commands *ex cathedra*, he is to be obeyed. I shall doubtless be told by the *Guardian* that the bishop of the chair of Jerusalem is infallible *ex cathedra*, as well as the Pope. To this I would answer, Certainly, but on one condition, viz. that the judgment of the said bishop is confirmed by "the Chair itself of Peter," which is "the Rock of the Catholic Church," against which it was said "the gates of hell shall not prevail." And besides no episcopal chair is any true chair at all, unless it be united with the Chair of Peter at Rome; for, as S. Cyprian well said, "God is one, Christ is one, the Church one, and the Chair one."* The argument, then, of the *Guardian* is

* Opera S. Cyp., Ep. xl. ad Pleb., p. 53.

absolutely groundless; and this is evident when we take into consideration the clauses and passages it has omitted, which fully explain S. Augustine's meaning, and show how careful he was always to draw the distinction between the Chair and the person who fills it.

The teaching of S. Augustine, then, is clear and manifest; he held that S. Peter and the Successors to his Chair occupied the "Summit of Authority," rebellion against which was held by him to be either "the height of impiety or headlong presumption."

CHAPTER IV.

RECAPITULATION.

In its criticism on "The Evidence for the Papacy" as derived from the works of S. Chrysostom, the *Guardian* has the assurance to inform its readers that it "will not bear the slightest cross-examination," and that "Mr. Lindsay, *more suo*, ignores the whole mass of counter-evidence deducible from the great Archbishop's life and correspondence."* This confident assertion of the *Guardian* is, I suppose, intended to apply, if not to S. Leo (for it is admitted that "the claims made by him are probably among the strongest that can be adduced,"—a very large admission considering the very high repute this great Pope and Doctor enjoyed for learning and sanctity), at least to two Œcumenical Councils, and to the works of S. Augustine, S. Jerome, S. Basil, and S. Gregory of Nazianzum. This challenge of the *Guardian* has been, I cannot but think, satisfactorily disposed of.

1. The *Guardian* averred that the claims made by S. Leo were "contradicted by the voice of two great gatherings, accepted throughout Christendom as Œcumenical, the Council of Constantinople and the Council of Chalcedon."

* The *Guardian*, Sept. 7, 1870.

I have produced evidence from these very Councils showing that this allegation is not true; that not only did they not contradict these "claims," but that they, especially the last named, positively accept and affirm them as fully as possible. It is impossible to read the acts of the Council of Chalcedon, and let me add the intermediate Œcumenical Council of Ephesus (a Council received by the Anglican Church and State as Œcumenical), without perceiving that the following points of truth were admitted and asserted: (1) that S. Peter was the "Rock and Foundation of the Catholic Church and of the orthodox Faith"; "the Head of all the Faith, as also of the Apostles"; "Pillar of the Faith," who "received from Jesus Christ the Keys of the Kingdom of heaven, and power to bind and loose sins." (2) That S. Peter, "even to the present time, lives and exercises these judicial powers in his Successors." (3) That the Pope—at the period of this Council of Ephesus, S. Celestine; in that of Chalcedon, S. Leo; and now, in this nineteenth century, Pius IX.—"at this time holds his [Peter's] place"; that is, as the "Rock and Foundation of the Catholic Church and of the orthodox Faith," "the Head of all the Faith," the Pillar, the Judge, and as the Custodian and Supreme dispenser of "the Keys of the Kingdom of heaven." (4) That the Popes, from time immemorial, have exercised these Prerogatives and powers by enforcing their decrees by means of their Letters, which possessed such authority that the Œcumenical Council of Ephesus confessed its obligation to obey them, no less than the "Canons of

the Church": and also by judging, deposing, and restoring Bishops—even the Patriarchs—by his sole authority; for, as S. Cyril, Patriarch of Alexandria, admitted, he was not only "Patriarch and Father of the mighty city of Rome," but also "Archbishop of the whole habitable globe." And nothing demonstrated this power so conclusively as the form of the sentence pronounced by the Papal Legates on Dioscorus, the Patriarch of Alexandria, in the presence of the Bishops, some 600 in number, and in that of the Emperor's representatives, when they, on behalf of the Pope, deprived him not merely of his See, but of the "Episcopal dignity and every sacerdotal ministry."

I say this was done in the presence of these Fathers and of the Emperor's officials, and received by them not only without a murmur of dissent, but with their manifest approval. By their assent and obedience to the commands of the Legates, who ordered them to "decree concerning him in conformity with the canons," they admitted (1) the power of the Pope to degrade by his sole will Bishops of the Catholic Church of the highest rank; and (2) to deprive them of their Sees by his single sentence; and (3) his right to command Councils—even Œcumenical Councils—to obey and carry into effect his sentence. The cases of Nestorius, Dioscorus, Eutyches, Maximus, &c., are examples in point. But not only have the Fathers of these Œcumenical Councils admitted these claims of the Pope, they have asserted them deliberately and affirmatively, even when the Legates of the Pope were stretching to the utmost

extent (so Anglicans say) the Papal Prerogative. "Peter has thus spoken by Leo," cried out all the Fathers when they had heard read the celebrated tome of S. Leo; Thou art "the constituted Interpreter to all men of the Voice of the Blessed Peter," "Thou didst preside as the Head over the members," *i. e.* the Bishops; and accusing Dioscorus of his wicked presumption in threatening to excommunicate the Pope, "to whom" they, in their indignation, emphatically add, "the custody of the Vineyard is committed by the Saviour." No testimony in favour of so-called "Ultramontanism" can be more clear, more definite, more decisive, and more conclusive than that which the assembled Fathers of the Œcumenical Councils of Ephesus and Chalcedon, either singly or together, delivered on this cardinal point.

And as regards the 28th Canon of Chalcedon, I have proved, firstly, from the acts of the Council, that it was enacted out of session by a few, in the absence of both the Legates and the Imperial officers; secondly, that even if it be a legitimate canon, it will not bear the signification the *Guardian* and others endeavour to fasten upon it, because the very Fathers who passed it express a hope that the Pope would continue to "extend his customary care to the Church of Constantinople, and to enlighten it with his Apostolic ray." And the Emperors Marcian and Valentinian III., under whose influence this canon was made, expressly acknowledged the Pope's Prerogatives, not merely by virtue of the dignity of the ancient Imperial city, but because of his "Headship of the Episcopate

of the Divine Faith," which was vested in him, as the same Valentinian and also Theodosius assert, "on account of the Merit of Peter, Chief of the corona of Bishops." What, then, is the result of this "cross-examination"? Clearly that the *Guardian* has been convicted of having made assertions utterly untrue and without foundation, and that, so far from "the voice of two great gatherings, accepted throughout Christendom as œcumenical," contradicting the claims of S. Leo, they have both accepted and affirmed them as clearly and positively as words and action could express.

2. I have recapitulated my remarks on S. Leo and the Œcumenical Councils more fully than perhaps you may think necessary, but I have done so for two objects: first, to impress upon your mind what the testimony of these Councils really is on the question at issue; and secondly, in order to show that this testimony governs, overrides, *and interprets* the testimony of all the Fathers on the subject of the Papal Supremacy.

When S. Chrysostom appealed to the Pope, and asked him to exercise his coercive Jurisdiction, "that they who have been proved to have acted against all law" may "be subjected to the laws of the Church," we see by the Light of these Œcumenical Councils what he understood the position of the Pope to be. He recognized him as the Successor of S. Peter,—not Peter as an Apostle merely, but S. Peter as the One to whom our Lord had committed His Sheep to be fed, and after him, to his Successors; and as *the* Authority in the Catholic

Church for maintaining unity and peace, and for *enforcing* order and obedience within the Fold.

So likewise in the case of S. Basil. His references to the "visit" of S. Damasus, the "visit by letter" of S. Dionysius a century previously, the restoration of Bishop Eustathius of Sebaste by the Pope, notwithstanding his having been deprived by the Council of Tyana, to which act of the Pope the said synod submitted on perusing the Papal Letter, show clearly, when compared with the acts of the above-named Œcumenical Councils, that S. Basil held the doctrine of the Supremacy of the Holy See. Indeed, he explicitly acknowledged it when, in his Letter to S. Damasus, he requests him "to send persons" who "may reconcile those who are at variance," and to "restore to mutual love the Churches of God," *i. e.* those in the East. And further, when he says to the Pope, that "unless you be moved to aid us at once, you will not in a short time find any one to stretch out your hand to, as all will have passed under the sway of heresy."

When we compare these words with the "voice of the two great gatherings, accepted as œcumenical throughout Christendom," how can we legitimately doubt that S. Basil, being a Catholic bishop, held to the full the dogma of the Papal Supremacy? It is impossible honestly, I maintain, to put any other construction on the words of these great Fathers. And again, still keeping in view these two great Œcumenical Councils, when S. Gregory of Nazianzum declared that the Roman Church "Presided over all," we perceive at a glance that in those few words he necessarily believed what those Councils

taught touching this question. Doubtless the testimonies of S. Chrysostom, S. Basil, and S. Gregory of Nazianzum, considered separately, do not prove very much, and that, if we had to depend solely upon their testimonies, they would not be sufficient to establish with precision the Supremacy of the Holy See; but when we compare them with the "voice of the two great gatherings accepted as œcumenical by all Christendom," how can we for a moment doubt what these great Oriental Fathers intended to hold and teach? Separately, they say but little; but taken together, their united testimony is strong; and comparing it with the doctrine as accepted and affirmed by the above-named Œcumenical Councils, it is irrefragable. It is like the bundle of sticks, which, when separated, are so weak that a child can break them, but when bound together by the chain of these Œcumenical Councils, then neither the *Guardian* nor any other Anglican serial, neither Anglican controversialists, nor Greek schismatics, even if they coalesced for the purpose,—no, not even the whole world, would have power to break any one of them.

3. The same argument applies to the two great Latin Fathers and Doctors, S. Jerome and S. Augustine. Let it be granted that they had said little or nothing concerning the Supremacy, or that what they had written was of doubtful interpretation; the authority of two great Councils is at hand to supply all deficiencies in their written statements, and to interpret what is not clear; for, being Catholic Fathers, they necessarily accepted, implicitly at

least, and by anticipation, everything those Councils accepted and affirmed respecting the position of the Holy See.

But we do not need to apply to these Fathers the superior authority of the Œcumenical Councils; they speak for themselves, and in language so plain, that it is marvellous that Anglicans cannot perceive their force and meaning. I have entered largely into this matter, and notwithstanding the *Guardian's* assertion, it has been proved that they both taught the doctrine of the Papal Supremacy with clearness and precision. S. Jerome may indeed have been of an irascible temperament, but that circumstance does not in the least degree vitiate his evidence. I showed that truth is often forced into view by means of the infirmities of men. His "violent" appeal to Pope S. Damasus brings out his testimony, that in questions of difficulty, the Pope was regarded as the proper Judge for their solution.

It is also evident that S. Jerome believed that communion with the Chair of Peter, that is, the Roman Chair, wherein "the Successor of the Fisherman" sat, was necessary for salvation; for he says, "Following no Chief but Christ, I am joined in communion with your Holiness, that is, with the Chair of Peter. Upon that Rock I know the Church is built. Whosoever eats the Lamb out of this House [*i.e.* the Roman Church, and the Churches subject to her] is profane." A Church which is compared to the Ark of Noah, out of which all must perish when the deluge of this world prevails, at the helm of which is the "Chair of Peter," wherein sits the Chief, must

indeed be the Supreme Church, having power and authority to command obedience. To this Chair S. Jerome looked for redress in the scandal of the Church of Antioch; "Meanwhile I cry aloud," says he, "if any one is united to the Chair of Peter he is mine"; and then he implores the Pope to inform him by letter, "with whom I ought to have communion in Syria." It is idle to dispute S. Jerome's clear testimony for the Supremacy.

4. With regard to S. Augustine, you have now seen how false is the assertion that S. Augustine wrote so little concerning the Supremacy of the Holy See. I have shown that his testimony is full, clear, and precise with respect to the position, both of S. Peter and his Successors, the Bishops of Rome.

Permit me to recapitulate carefully, yet briefly, what he has written about them. You remember that he described S. Peter as the "Figure," the "Representative," and the "Type" of the one Church, as the Rock built upon the Rock; for, as he argues, "Peter [Rock] is so called from the Rock, not the Rock from Peter; as Christ is not called Christ from the Christian, but the Christian from Christ": therefore, as all are Christians from Christ, so all are Rocks or Stones from Peter, the Rock, himself being built upon Christ. But S. Peter was not merely a Figure or Type; he was himself the Church, whole and entire. "Singly," S. Augustine said, "Christ formed the Church" in Peter, who "alone" received "the Keys," which were afterwards extended to the rest. Hence S. Peter was the "First Apostle"; hence he obtained "the Primacy of the

Apostleship," and likewise "the Princedom of the Apostolate"; hence, too, "he received the whole world," for, being the Chief of the Apostles, and the Prince and Ruler,—being at first, solely and exclusively, the Church, and the spiritual ancestor of "the Christian People,"—he merited to have the whole world for his Kingdom, which he was charged to govern, rule, and feed, as the Vicar and Representative of our Lord Jesus Christ.

That S. Augustine meant this is most evident, as I have shown by his comments on the passage, "Feed My Sheep," "Feed My Lambs," wherein he asserts that our Lord delivered to S. Peter this charge, not merely as one of the Apostles, but as His "Other Self," or His Second Self; and in order to show the reality of this intimate connection between Himself and Peter, S. Augustine compares it to the union of a husband with his wife, saying, "Even as a bride and bridegroom are two in one flesh."

It is of the greatest importance we should form a correct estimate of what S. Augustine understood concerning S. Peter's place in the Church before we can fully comprehend his doctrine touching the Papal Supremacy. That he believed the Pope to be what Peter was has been proved, in that he taught that he was his Successor to the Chair of Peter, that in consequence the Roman Church possessed the "Princedom of the Apostolic Chair," which S. Augustine said "had at all times been in force"; that it was "the Summit of Authority," to disregard which is "the height of impiety" or "headlong presumption." And further, that this Roman Church, this Holy See, this Chair of Peter, "is the

Rock against which the proud gates of hell shall not prevail." It is in vain, then, for the *Guardian* or any other of the Reviewers of my late work to get rid of the fact so clearly and precisely stated by this great Father of Fathers, that the Roman Church, by virtue of the "Chair of Peter," is the Supreme Church, to which every other Church is subject, whose Princedom "has at all times been in force."

S. Augustine, you will remember, gives two practical illustrations of this his belief: first, by asserting, in answer to the question, What keeps me in the Catholic Church? *inter alia*, he says, "The Succession of Priests [Bishops] from the CHAIR ITSELF of Peter, down even to the present Bishop, unto whom [Peter, *i.e.* as 'His Other Self'] the Lord, after His Resurrection, committed His Sheep to be fed, keeps me"; and secondly, by his obeying a command of the Pope S. Zosimus to deliver Cæsarea in Africa from the curse of the Donatist schism and to restore peace.

5. Very little need be repeated concerning the testimony of the ante-Nicene Church. The testimony is not indeed very large, but what there is of it is clear and precise. The two Apostolic Fathers, S. Ignatius, the friend and Successor of S. Peter in the See of Antioch, and S. Irenæus, the disciple of S. Polycarp, the follower of S. John, unequivocally affirm the fact,—the former, that the Roman Church "Presided over the Love, in the Name of the Son and in the Name of the Father"; and the latter, that the Roman Church was "constituted at Rome by the two most glorious Apostles Peter

and Paul"; that "it is a matter of necessity that every Church should agree with this the [Roman] Church, because of its superior Princedom, that is, the Faithful everywhere, inasmuch as the Apostolical tradition has been preserved by those who dwell on all sides." None of my Reviewers seemed to have criticised the evidence of these two Apostolic Fathers, because no doubt they felt that it was absolutely proof against all subterfuge, and that no argument could avail against its most evident meaning.

6. The arguments against the testimony of S. Cyprian have been shown to be utterly baseless. To maintain them is, in point of fact, to destroy S. Cyprian's character as a witness for the truth; to prove that he was a heretic, not merely in respect to the question of rebaptism, but concerning the very principles of Church government. S. Cyprian is made to assert that he was himself Pope to himself and his own flock, and that no other bishop or bishops, singly or collectively, had any authority over him, but only the Lord, and that, too, not till the day of judgment. Happily, S. Cyprian gave practical proof that such a monstrous doctrine was not held by him, for in the case of Marcianus, the heretical Primate of Gaul, he urged the Pope, the very same Pope whose authority he is said to have impugned, to cause him to be deposed from his see and another bishop to be appointed.

7. The Meletian schism, as it is called, and the dispute between the African synod and the Pope, when examined, do not really give any support to

the Anglican cause. The former related to a double election to the see, the claims on both sides being so equal, and both, moreover, supported by the leading prelates of the day, that it was impossible for the Holy See to determine who was the one really elected; while the latter was a dispute, not about doctrine of faith or morals, but concerning discipline, viz. whether a certain priest, Apiarius by name, had or had not been guilty of gross crimes. That the African Fathers fully acknowledged the Papal Supremacy over all greater causes, such as are of faith, is clear from the testimonies of S. Augustine, S. Optatus of Milevis, and the synodical letters of the Councils of Carthage and Milevis to the Pope, requesting his confirmation of their decrees.

8. It is plain, then, that neither the *Guardian* nor any other Anglican review has been able to break down on any important point the direct evidence for the Papacy as contained in my late work. Indeed, finding how futile has been the attempt, they, especially the *Guardian*, have had recourse to very questionable means, with the view of casting discredit on that evidence; viz. mistranslating certain passages appealed to as "counter evidence"; suppressing clauses of sentences, and even whole passages, which explain the meaning intended to be conveyed by the Fathers. This is the "*more suo*" of the *Guardian*, by which it is hoped, *coûte qui coûte*, to make a good case against the Catholic Church.

9. And now with regard to my first allegation, that the Reviewer in the *Guardian* has

been guilty of so handling the text of the Fathers as to give to his readers an entirely false idea of its real intention and meaning. After arguing against "the Evidence for the Papacy" as contained in S. Chrysostom's works, he triumphantly refers his readers to the letter to Venerius, Bishop of Milan, as given above (page 80). I showed that the words, "your care on behalf of the Churches," did not fairly represent the original; that the word "care," in English, has an ambiguous interpretation, that it might mean "care" in the sense of taking an authoritative charge of a person, thing, or place, or in the sense of "feeling," that is, sympathy for another. The *Guardian* used the word "care" in the former sense, and then turns round upon me and declares that, had this letter been addressed to the Roman Pontiff, it would have been regarded as proof of his Supremacy. In a word, he meant to show that the authority and jurisdiction of Milan was at least as good as that of Rome, and that S. Chrysostom assumed as much. But unfortunately for this Reviewer, he is at fault, for the word κηδεμονία does not signify "care" in the sense of authoritative charge, but "solicitude," that is, friendly intervention, the act of one equal assisting, by his personal influence and moral weight, another equal.

10. This Reviewer, I pointed out, has not scrupled to suppress everything that opposed or modified the meaning of the passages he advanced as "counter evidence." The appeal to the 28th Canon of Chalcedon ought not to have been made without at the same time presenting to his readers the explana-

tions of the Emperor's officials, and of the Fathers themselves in their synodical epistle to the Pope, and also the letters of three Roman Emperors, which would have proved conclusively that the Anglican interpretation persistently put upon that canon will not bear investigation. To suppress these portions of the acts and decrees of Œcumenical Councils, and the Imperial letters, was at least of more than doubtful propriety. Nor was it right to assert that the claims put forth by S. Leo were "contradicted by the voice of two great gatherings accepted throughout Christendom as œcumenical," when, if the *Guardian* had supplied its readers with the above-mentioned acts and decrees, they would have seen that "the voice" had not only not contradicted them, but, on the contrary, had affirmed them in language which cannot possibly be distorted.

11. The liberty, however, taken with S. Augustine exceeds everything I have ever heard or read of (except one instance, to which I will advert presently), and which, I think, ought to convince every sincere and honest man how little reliance can be placed upon the *Guardian* in a matter of controversy. Adopting the words of Janus, he said, "Yet from all his numerous works, filling ten folios, only one sentence, in one letter, can be quoted, where he says that the principality of the Apostolic Chair has always been in Rome, which, of course, could be said then with equal truth of Antioch, Jerusalem, and Alexandria." I have shown that these words are untrue, evasive, and deceptive, and that the most important word in the

sentence, viz. the verb, was omitted. I have shown from many passages interspersed amongst his "ten folios," that S. Augustine has in a variety of ways been a witness for the Papacy, in which he has employed language which denotes the Supremacy, Authority, and Power of the Holy See. I proved that the quoted words, "Principality of the Apostolic Chair had always been in Rome"—were not what S. Augustine really said, but that he wrote "in Rome, wherein the Princedom of the Apostolic Chair had at all times been *in force*," which bears a signification somewhat different.

Another passage from this great Father has likewise been even more grossly tampered with, and a meaning put upon it radically false. As a hit against the Papacy, the *Guardian* quoted, "In this order of Successors [of the Bishops of Rome] no Donatist Bishop is to be found. But even if any traitor had crept into that line of bishops which is continued from Peter to Anastasius, who now holds the same Seat, this would prove no injury to the Church and innocent Christians." Now why was the conclusion of the sentence not given by the *Guardian*, as it would have explained to its readers what S. Augustine really meant? "This would prove no injury to the Church and innocent Christians, for whom the Lord providing says of evil rulers, 'Whatsoever they shall say, do; but what they do, do not, for they say and do not.'" These last words were uttered by our Lord against the Pharisees, who, by their hypocritical conduct, misled the people. Let me give again the full passage: "The Scribes and

Pharisees sit in the seat of Moses; all therefore whatsoever they bid you observe, that observe and do; but do not after their works; for they say and do not."

Our blessed Lord here distinguishes between the *Chair* and the *Person*. When a command is issued by him who sits in that Chair, that, said He, "observe and do," because he decrees by the authority of that Chair, *i.e.* in modern language, *ex cathedra;* but as regards the conduct and example of the person, if he acts not in accordance with his *ex cathedra* decrees, that, said our Lord, "do not," for they "say and do not." S. Augustine thus comments on these words: "Did He not commend that chair of Moses, and, saving the honour of the chair, reprove them? For, He said, 'They sit in the chair of Moses,'" &c. To omit, then, the conclusion of the sentence in the passage the *Guardian* quoted against the Supremacy was not an honest proceeding, inasmuch as, without it, the passage would appear to assume the possibility of the Bishop of Rome, *as Pope*, becoming a Donatist. This was far from this great Father's meaning. As our Lord had distinguished between the chair of Moses and the person of its occupant, so did S. Augustine distinguish between the Chair of Peter and the mere Person of the Pope, and the omitted clause indicates this so implicitly as to amount almost, if not quite, to an explicit statement of the fact. It was possible for the Bishop of Rome, simply, to have sided with the Donatists, in which conduct none could lawfully follow him; he would have been a "traitor" to the unity he was commissioned to preserve; but

the Bishop of Rome, no matter how guilty he might be as a bishop, when acting as Pope, and sitting in the Chair of Peter, and commanding *ex cathedra*, is quite another question; and from the reference S. Augustine made to this incident in the Gospel, it would follow, that as obedience was due to the decree of the chair of Moses, when uttered by hypocritical Pharisees, so obedience is to be given to the decree of the Chair of Peter, although the Pope may be guilty of every crime and heresy forbidden by the laws of God and the canons of the Church. The slap, then, against the Roman Church is ineffective.

The *Guardian* produced a passage from S. Gregory of Nazianzum, as showing that his words indicated that the See of Constantinople was at least as authoritative as the Holy See, because he says it was "the common emporium of the Faith." But in the original the Greek article does not appear, and therefore the passage ought to be rendered, "a common emporium of the Faith," which is a very different thing from "THE common emporium of the Faith," indicating that Constantinople, and not Rome, was the centre of unity and of faith.

These specimens of mistranslation, suppression of important clauses and portions of the documents quoted, and the liberty taken with the Greek article, for the purpose of setting up a case against the evidence for the Papacy, which they cannot fairly, openly, and directly assail, are, I hesitate not to assert, a crime against truth, and a crime against the very souls of those who, for want

of the necessary knowledge, are unable to detect the artifices of controversialists, whose principal aim seems to be the establishment of their own opinions. Whether the Reviewer in the *Guardian* was aware of the impropriety of mistranslating and suppressing important passages and clauses, and of tampering with an important feature of the Greek original, is best known to himself. It really seems with some that, on the principle, "all is fair in war and love," it is justifiable to so manipulate the writings of the holy Fathers and acts and decrees of Œcumenical Councils as to make them assert what they do not mean to say, and to so interpret their occasional doubtful phraseology concerning some points as to force them into a position of antagonism to the *consensus patrum* of the Universal Church.

I well remember, before I became a Catholic, I complained to some learned Anglicans—men of high repute and eminence—of the gross liberties some of the old English writers had taken in their manner of quoting the Fathers and Councils; the only answer I received was that they "were only slips, which were customary in those days." Slips! Every untruth, I suppose, is a "slip" of the tongue; every false statement, a "slip" of the pen; every omission of an important sentence or clause in a passage is a "slip" of the memory! Granted they were slips: it was by these "slips" the so-called reformers were enabled to cheat the people of England, and of Scotland our own dear country, out of the religion of their ancestors, the religion of the holy

Fathers in all ages, the religion of the Apostles and of Christ, who said to S. Peter, "Thou art Rock, and upon this Rock will I build My Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it; and I will give unto thee the Keys of the Kingdom of heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven"; and who also said, "I have prayed for thee [Peter], that thy faith fail not, and when thou art converted, Confirm thy brethren"; and who also further added, "Feed My Lambs," "Feed My Sheep." And in order to show that these four offices of S. Peter—the Rock, the Judge, the Confirmer, and the Shepherd,—as well as those other offices which belonged in common to all the Apostles, were not *merely* personal, but official, that is, that they were to descend respectively to successors, *i. e.* of Peter as the Head, and the Apostles generally, our gracious Lord, in the concluding sentence of the Charter of the Universal Church, declared, "And lo! I am with you all days, even unto the consummation."

BOOK II.

THE MYSTERY OF INIQUITY.

CHAPTER I.

INTRODUCTORY.

I HAVE, my dear friend, I think, sufficiently disposed of the principal objections raised against the doctrine of the Papal Supremacy by those who did me the honour of reviewing or noticing my late work, "The Evidence for the Papacy." Many minor points I have not touched upon, simply because, in my judgment, it would have been waste of time, fulfilling no good purpose. We know that all great questions of faith—as, for instance, the dogmas concerning the Holy Trinity, the Incarnation, the Divinity of Christ, the Double Procession, as some style it—are, from their immensity and infinitude, surrounded by difficulties which have engaged the intellectual scrutiny of holy and learned men in every age. The doctrine, then, that Christ our God, our High-Priest and Sovereign Lord, should have, for our benefit and guidance, instituted a vicariate office in His Church, to be filled

continuously by one who should be on earth His Vicar, His Representative, His Lieutenant, partaking of that plenitude of power, authority, and jurisdiction which He, as "the Man Christ Jesus," had received from the Father, who had conferred upon Him "all power in heaven and on earth," ought not to create any difficulty in our minds. And I think you will agree with me that the only question is, is the doctrine true or false? Is it founded upon evidence as conclusive at least as that upon which the Church relies for other great doctrines of the Faith? True, in every age of the Church there have been some who have more or less questioned the truth of the Papal Supremacy; but this is just as true in respect to the dogma of our Lord's Divinity; and if the oppositions of men, and even of councils, are to be taken as proof positive against it, then, for the same reason, it must be concluded that Christ is not God. It is easier to overthrow the dogma of the Divinity of our Lord than that of the Papal Supremacy, for there is more evidence presentable for the latter than for the former, and greater opposition on the part of men.

But there is nothing extraordinary in this. What is Faith, but "the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen"?* If every point was easy of solution, if everything was self-evident, if every subject of revelation was so clear that nothing could be doubted, then where would be the exercise of our Faith? We received our

* Heb. xi. 1.

confession of Faith, not from man, not by means of study or contemplation, but from God and the Catholic Church, to which He revealed it by the Holy Ghost. Faith, then, is the acceptance of truth, which we do not comprehend, simply because it has been revealed, and proposed to us for acceptance by the Church. The Church, aye, say you, But what is the Church? Where is the Church, and how am I to distinguish the true Church from the false? Find me the true Church, even that Church which S. Paul declared to be "the Church of the Living God, the pillar and ground of the Truth,"* and then I will believe every dogma she commands me to accept; but until that Church be discovered, it is simply absurd for you to tell me, that Faith is that which has been revealed, and proposed for our acceptance by the Church. There is some reason in your objection, and I hope, in the course of my Letter, to demonstrate where that Church, which is indeed everywhere, may be found.

But before I proceed to touch upon this point, let us for a while quit the arena of strife and controversy, and take, if possible, a calmer view of God's general dealings with us, in this world which we inhabit. Let us ask ourselves who and what are we, whence came we, what is our vocation here, whither go we, and what our destiny hereafter? What is this world; for what was it originally created; what is its use in time, what will be its fate hereafter? Who is

* 1 Tim. iii. 15.

Satan, whence is he, what is his connection with this earth and us, and to what extent has he power to rule mundane affairs, and what will be his end? And then our dear Lord, why did He unite our nature to His Godhead, why did He suffer and die, what is the peculiarity of His mission here, and what will be the final result? And lastly, His Empire-Church, why did He create it, and what is its mission in this world? These are indeed mighty questions. I am not so vain as to suppose I can answer them; to do so would require a mind and a wisdom far beyond the most gifted scholar; indeed, nothing less than inspiration of the Holy Ghost would enable any one exhaustively to solve them.

But in our humble way, we can endeavour to obtain some glimpses of the mighty truths involved in these great questions, which will, I think, materially aid us in the investigation of the main subject of this Epistle.

You will admit that we men are the involuntary witnesses of vast supernatural phenomena. We observe great moral forces at play, and all the spiritual and intellectual powers of man in full operation, for the accomplishment of some great end, hidden from the minds of mankind in general. We see all society arrayed in hostile parties—nation against nation, sect against sect, party against party; opinions formed and elaborated for or against some points; heresies broached and put into practice, and large numbers of men forced to adopt them. In a word, we have before our very eyes, playing before us, and in the midst of us, a great and tremendous drama,

of which this world is the stage, and ourselves the living and moving actors, prompted and directed by agents we see not, but whose all-mastering influence we feel, by which we are compelled to take our part, whether we will or no. So powerless are we—I am speaking of ourselves as a whole—that we may as well attempt to arrest the machinery of the heavens as to think of controlling those great spiritual forces, directed, as they are under God, by intelligences far superior to us in knowledge, wisdom, and power. I propose to call your attention to some points important to our subject, by which I hope to convince you that God has established upon this earth a great Empire-Church, and therein His Monarchy, and this for a twofold object, the destruction of the kingdom and power of Satan, and the salvation of such of mankind who believe in Christ and are obedient to His laws.

CHAPTER II.

THE PRE-ADAMITE AGES.

THERE was a time when no such thing as evil existed; when all the angelic hosts in their nine orders were faithful and obedient subjects of their great Creator; when all, with one voice and perfect harmony, sang the great song of adoration, "Holy, holy, holy Lord God of Hosts, heaven and earth are full of His glory";* "Alleluia, Alleluia, Alleluia."†

But where did those millions of angels dwell in that illimitable space, which knows no bounds, either in height or depth, or in width or breadth? Did they, during their probational period, dwell in those myriads of stars that bespangle the blue ethereal vault of heaven? Was this planet once upon a time—that is, before the creation of the present system—the habitation and principality of some of those intelligent creatures? Had the archangel, whose name is Satan, any connection with this globe; was he, for instance, its Supreme Ruler? Did he and his subject spirits ever inhabit it as their home? True, they are spirits, and require not an atmosphere like our own to dwell in, nor

* Isai. vi. 3; Rev. iv. 8. † *Ib.* xix. 1.

do they need food, as we do, for sustenance; but we must not forget that these conditions may have been entirely different in the pre-Adamite* ages. That they had a local habitation of some sort for their residence may be inferred from what our Lord has said respecting our own position hereafter, when we shall be "as the Angels"; "In My Father's house are many mansions"; and from what fell from S. Paul, who speaks of a "third heaven,"† showing that there must have been a first and a second: Origen says that there are "many heavens";‡ so that it is more than probable that spirits have a habitation (indeed, S. Jude says so, whom I will quote presently) doubtless in various parts of the universe.

There are some who will regard these as idle questions; but surely, if they consider the whole case, they will form a different opinion. For consider the fact that this earth is the theatre of the great war which is being waged between God on the one side, and Satan on the other. Indeed, S. Paul affirms as much when he says that "we wrestle not against flesh and blood, but against principalities, against powers, against the rulers of the darkness of this world, and against wicked spirits in heavenly places."§ It is here where Satan attempted to destroy the works of God, and

* I use this term as signifying the period before the commencement of the six days' creation of the world as it is now.

† S. Matt. xxiii. 30; S. John xiv. 2; 2 Cor. xii. 2.

‡ Opera Origen., t. iii. in Matt. tom. xiii. n. 31.

§ Ephes. vi. 12.

in great measure succeeded; it is in this globe that Christ was born, and afterwards suffered; it is here where the great struggle for the souls of men is being, even now, carried on, and consequently it cannot but be apposite to our subject to obtain a somewhat clear understanding of every circumstance connected with this matter. The question arises, why was our earth, in preference to other planets, say, Jupiter, Mercury, or Venus, selected by Satan as the theatre of his war against Christ? And why was our race chosen by him as the object of his malevolence? To elucidate these points we must endeavour to ascertain, as far as is possible to us finite beings, the origin of evil.

The opening verses of the book of Genesis put before us three great and tremendous facts. First, the original creation, myriads of ages ago: "In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth";* that is to say, that originally God called into existence the whole universe, and that too in an instant. "By the word of the Lord were the heavens made; and all the host of them by the Breath of His mouth;" "For He spake, and it was done; He commanded, and it stood fast."†

* Gen. i. 1. † Ps. xxxiii. 6–9.

It does not follow from this passage that the world as we know it, *i. e.* as fully developed in every department in nature, was so created by God in the beginning. Indeed, the first chapter of Genesis and geological discoveries contradict this notion. But this seems to be the fact, that the globe, and the system appertaining to it, together with all the laws that govern it externally, *i. e.* its atmosphere; and internally, *i. e.* the forces within (still a mystery), were called into existence in an instant, as the

Secondly, it is stated that this earth "was without form and void";* that is, it was in a disorganized condition, without animal and vegetable life, and enveloped in impenetrable darkness. Was there a period between the original creation at the first beginning and that of its chaotic state, during which a race of intelligent creatures were dwelling in this world? Holy Scripture seems to imply that this may have been the case, and science, the handmaid of religion, helps to confirm this idea. The vast number of fossils of creatures of the lower creation, held to have been of pre-Adamite construction, presuppose the fact that animal life existed before the present formation. If so, it is reasonable to believe that at the same time there may have been intelligent beings of some sort existing. And the remains, too, of vegetable life, petrified timbers, and mineral substances which derive their origin from periods far beyond human history, point to the same conclusion.†

text implies, by the command of God; and that from that moment growth and development commenced, in accordance with those natural laws which God in His wisdom instituted.

* Gen. i. 2.

† With regard to the great antiquity of this globe, geology and its kindred sciences indicate without doubt that it must have existed for millions upon millions of years. The value of science as the interpreter of certain points of revelation cannot be overrated. "The study," says Professor Buckland, "of these Remains" (*i. e.* animal and vegetable, or organic remains) "will form our most interesting and instructive subject of inquiry, since it is in them that we shall find the great master key whereby we may unlock the secret history of the earth. They are documents which contain the evidences of revolutions and catastrophes, long ante-

Then, again, the condition of the present world demonstrates that at some time or other terrific

cedent to the creation of the human race; they open the book of nature, and swell the volumes of science, with the Records of many successive series of animal and vegetable generations, of which the Creation and Extinction would have been equally unknown to us, but for recent discoveries in the science of Geology."—("Geology and Mineralogy," vol. i. p. 128. Lond. 1836. Bridg. Treat.) With regard to fossils of animals, the Professor says: ". . . the fact of no human remains having as yet been found in conjunction with those of extinct animals, may be alleged in confirmation of the hypothesis that those animals lived and died before the creation of man."—(*Ib.* p. 103.) Concerning the remains of a pre-Adamite forest in Portland, he says: ". . . The silicified fossil trunks of Cycadeæ are found in the isle of Portland immediately above the surface of the Portland stone, and below the Purbeck stone. They are lodged in the same beds of black mould in which they grew, and are accompanied by prostrate trunks of large coniferous trees, converted to flint, and by stumps of these trees standing erect with their roots still fixed in their native soil. . . . They prove that plants belonging to a family that is now confined to the warmer regions of the earth, were at a former period, natives of the southern coast of England."—(*Ib.* pp. 494, 495.) As regards coal, the same author says: ". . . We are all brought into immediate connection with the vegetation that clothed the ancient earth, before one-half of its actual surface had been formed. The trees of the primeval forests have not, like modern trees, undergone decay, yielding back their elements to the soil and atmosphere by which they had been nourished; but, treasured up in subterranean store-houses, have been transformed into enduring beds of coal, which in later ages have become to man the sources of heat and light and wealth."—(*Ib.* p. 66.) These examples indicate certainly the very great age of this globe. Millions of years it must have existed, of which the six thousand years of man's existence is but an infinitesimal fraction.

The next point is this: where must we place these milliards of centuries, during the creative week of six days, or between the first beginning, when "God created the heaven and the earth,"

convulsions must have occurred, which resulted in the production of vast ranges of inaccessible

and the period of chaos? Some say that the whole history of the globe is circumscribed within the creative week, and hence they hold that the six days are not natural days, but long epochs or ages. It seems to me that this is a most unwarrantable straining of the text. It is said that the original Hebrew word for day signifies epoch or age. Not being acquainted with that language, I cannot argue the point. In Kitto's "Cyclopædia of Biblical Literature" it is asserted that "here (Gen. i. 5) the word 'day' denotes the civil or calendar day of twenty-four hours, including the 'evening,' or natural night, and the 'morning,' or natural day. It is remarkable that in this account the 'evening,' or natural night, precedes the 'morning,' or natural day. Hence the Hebrew compound ערב־בקר [this is as I find in Kitto] 'evening-morning,' which is used by Daniel (viii. 14) to denote a civil day."—(See article DAY.) To ascertain the true meaning of the Hebrew text, we must consult the LXX version, which was a translation from the Hebrew into Greek before the Captivity, up to which time the purity of the text had been most carefully preserved. Now the Greek is an exact language, every word possesses a definite meaning, so that we shall be able to estimate the real force of the word "day." Now in the narrative of the Creation, after the description of each day's work, it is written, and the evening and the morning were the "first day," "the second day," &c., the LXX using the words *ἡμέρα μία*, *ἡμέρα δευτέρα*, and so on. This word *ἡμέρα* never signifies more than a natural day, unless there is some word or words accompanying it indicating a representative character. For example, Ezekiel was directed to lie on his side forty days: "I have appointed thee each day for a year" (Ezekiel iv. 6). It is obvious that the prophet was not to lie down literally forty years (which he must have done if a day really meant a year), but forty days, to indicate that the subject of the prophecy was to continue for this long term. Then, again, the language of Jacob in his address to Pharaoh does not prove that a day is a year; he says, "the days of the years of my pilgrimage are an hundred and thirty years" (Gen. xlvii. 9); that is, that I have lived as many days as are included in 130 years. Again, "One day is with the Lord

mountains, in the tearing asunder of the terrestrial mass, forming thereby both continents and islands,

as a thousand years, and a thousand years as one day" (2 Pet. iii. 8); that is, that a thousand years, in respect to duration of time, is to God as one day with us; for with Him there is no time, there being no past or future, but an eternal present.

In prophecy, probably a day may mean a year, but not really so in the mind of the Seer; for to him, all the events that would in future occur passed before his prophetic eyes in a moment of time, though in the actual fulfilment a day may be found to represent a year; but it is well known that prophetic language is exceptional: "Seventy weeks are determined upon thy people," &c. (Dan. ix. 24). And again, the language of Laban to Jacob: "Fulfil her week, and we will give thee this also for the service which thou shalt serve with me yet seven other years" (Gen. xxix. 27). The word ἑβδομάς, usually employed to express a week, does not, primarily, mean seven *days*, nor its seventh decade, ἑβδομήκοντα ἑβδομάδες, seventy *weeks*, but simply seven, or seventy, the subject of the number being determined by some word expressed or understood. Liddell and Scott thus define the word ἑβδομάς, giving their authorities; they say that this word signifies "*the number seven*," Philo. &c. II. *A number of seven*, Anth. Plan. 131; 2, *a time of seven days, a week*, Hipp. Aph. 1245, Arist. Pol. 6. 17, 2; also *of seven years, a septenary*, Plut. 2. 909 E, cf. Arist. Pol. 7. 16, 17. III. *The seventh day*, Eccl." The explanation, then, seems to me simple; viz. that Laban said to Jacob, "Fulfil her seven," that is, seven other years; and with respect to the prophecy of the "seventy weeks," it should be rendered, seventy sevens, that is, seventy times seven years. Of course, I know that this Greek word, *by custom*, signifies a week, but not strictly speaking; for literally it means the number seven, its subject, as I have said, being either expressed or understood. In the history of the Creation, then, it is, I think, imperative upon us to consider the word "day" as one revolution of the earth. The meaning, however, of the term seems to me fixed by the description of the fourth day's work, in which the same word ἡμέρα is used: "And God made two great lights; the greater light to rule the day [τῆς ἡμέρας], and the lesser light to

in some cases (to show the probability of this) the indenture of parts coinciding with the projection

rule the night" (Gen. i. 16). Here the word is restricted to the natural day.

If the LXX had understood the original Hebrew word to signify an age, they would have employed, as it appears to me, another word, viz. *αἰών*, which signifies a period of time—a dispensation. Many other considerations might be advanced to show, that to force the word "day" to signify years and thousands of years, is a violation of sound criticism; and besides, it tends to defeat the reason given by God in the fourth (Anglicè) commandment of the Decalogue for observing the Sabbath, viz. that "in *six days* God created the heaven and the earth, and rested upon the seventh day." If those days were each long periods of time, extending to thousands of years, the allusion, so far as finite man is concerned, would have had no point whatever; to him these words would have been empty sounds, conveying no definite idea to his intellect or conscience.

If this be so, where can we fix the millions of years that have evidently intervened since the first creation of this globe? I would answer, between the first beginning of all things and the six days of the creation of our present system. Origen seems to me to favour this view, though it is, perhaps, capable of another interpretation, as given by S. Jerome, too lengthy for insertion in the space I can afford; and besides, to render it intelligible, a dissertation more diffuse than the text would be required. Origen's meaning seems to me clear, whether right or wrong. In answer to objection, "What God was doing before the world began," he replies: "But reason gives a logical answer, viz. according to the rule of religion, when we say that not then for the first time did God begin to work when He made this visible world; but as, after its time, there will be another world, so also we believe that others existed before the present came into being. And both of these positions will be confirmed by the authority of Holy Scripture. For that there will be another world after this, is taught by Isaiah, who says, 'There will be a new heaven and a new earth, which I will make to abide in My sight, saith the Lord'; and that before this world others also existed, is shown

of their opposites, the strata of both in many cases being identical. And again, the carbonized appearance of rocks presupposes, with some degree of certitude, that between the original creation and the present formation there must have occurred some fearful judgment of fire so terrible in its effects as to reduce the whole earth to that condition of things known by the term chaos, described in Holy Writ as "without form and void," and covered by a darkness which was probably produced by steam, the effect of the conflagration which destroyed it.

The third fact given us is, that the world was reconstructed by God for the use of man.* There are some who suppose that no period of time existed between the original Creation and the state of desolation as described by the Word of God. It is assumed that the work of Creation was not the instantaneous act of God. It is held, or rather it is the necessary conclusion of those who so argue, that first there was a chaos; and from thence evolved a gradual and progressive creation, and

by Ecclesiastes, in the words: 'What is that which hath been? Even that which shall be. And what is that which has been created? Even this which is to be created: and there is nothing altogether new under the sun. Who shall speak and declare, Lo, this is new? It hath already been in the ages that have been before us.' By these testimonies it is established, both that there were ages before our own, and that there will be others after it. It is not, however, to be supposed that several worlds existed at once, but that after the end of this present world others will take their beginning; respecting which it is unnecessary to repeat each particular statement, seeing we have already done so in the preceding pages."—"De Princip.," t. i. l. iii. c. 5, n. 3.

* Gen. i. 3–31.

that no other intelligent creature ever resided in this world but man. Scripture and science, as I have already observed, contradict this theory. The text already quoted expressly says that the heaven and the earth were made by "the Breath of God," the effect of the Word he spoke; so much so, that whilst at one moment there was nothing, at the next all were in lively existence, with organisms suitable for each, in perfect condition and order. Confusion cannot generate order; there must be "form" and matter, and the principle of life, from which proceeds growth; but the world, as reduced to chaos, was dead, destroyed absolutely by fire, as the evidence of the rocks and other phenomena abundantly testify. The substance that remained after the fiery deluge could not of itself resuscitate life, any more than the ashes of a furnace. An actual power was necessitated to quicken the dead to life, and this quickening agency was provided, as is thus described: "The Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters;"* "And God said, Let there be light, and light was."†

Another point is worth some consideration. Did Almighty God create the world originally "without form and void"? It is impossible, because whatever God creates must of necessity be "very good." You remember that after the description of each day's creation of our present earth it was added, "It was good." One cannot imagine how God, by the "Breath of His mouth," and "by the Word of His power," could create an

* Gen. i. 2. † *Ib.* 3.

imperfection, a substance without life, and enveloped in such darkness as totally to obscure the light. God is not the Creator of death, but of life; of inanimate matter, but of living substances. How, then, could God be the Creator of the world in the chaotic state described in Holy Writ? It is impossible. By the principle of God's eternal goodness, it could not be. What, then, was the occasion of this chaos; of this formless void? It is impious to suppose that God could have made a beautiful world for the mere pleasure of destroying it. Nor can we believe that He made it so clumsily, so unscientifically, or so ignorantly, that in a few centuries it should be annihilated by a tremendous explosion by fire, the escape perhaps of gases which ought to have been provided against by the great Artificer and Arch-chemist of the universe.

There must then have been a cause which resulted in this destruction. What was that cause? It could be nothing else than the presence of evil. S. Peter, in telling us the cause of the deluge, and of the final destruction of this world at the end of this dispensation, reflects to our minds the real cause of the destruction of the pre-Adamite world: "By the word of God the heavens were of old, and the earth standing out of the water and in the water; whereby the world that then was, being overflowed with water, perished: but the heavens and the earth which are now, by the same word are kept in store, reserved unto fire against the day of judgment and perdition of ungodly men, ... in the which the heavens shall pass away with a great noise, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat, the earth

also and all the works that are therein shall be burned up . . . . nevertheless . . . . we look for new heavens and a new earth wherein dwelleth righteousness."* "Ungodly men" will be the cause of the ultimate destruction of this world. "Ungodly men" brought this same earth into desolation in the time of Noah; and hence we infer that sin and rebellion were the immediate cause of the annihilation of the pre-Adamite world, for which God rained down destruction upon it, reducing that which had been "very good" to a formless and defunct condition, void of life, and covered with darkness most impenetrable. If this be so, and I see not how it can be denied, then during the pre-Adamite period there must have been living here, or somehow intimately connected with it, a race of intelligent beings; for unless there were such, sin and rebellion could not have been committed, nor could any judgment have been pronounced and executed. Who, then, were those intelligent creatures? Does Holy Scripture give us any clue? The following circumstance, as mentioned in the Word of God, seems to imply that the fallen angels were once either the denizens of this earth, or in some other way (how, we know not) intimately connected with it, during, it may be supposed, their probational career, and at a period before the present creation, dwelling under conditions entirely different from those which exist now.

Let me here put together all the facts we can

* 2 Pet. iii. 5–13.

find in the Bible concerning this matter. First, it is stated that Satan, under the form of a serpent, entered into the garden of Eden; secondly, we notice that he is styled in Scripture as "the Prince of this world," "the Prince of the power of the air," and "the God of this world";* thirdly, that he was accustomed at his pleasure "to walk up and down" the earth, and from time to time to appear before God in company with "the sons of God";† fourthly, that he and his subject spirits once possessed somewhere a "habitation," or principality, which they "left," and are now "reserved in chains," doubtless in some place, "to the judgment of the great day."‡ These facts are given us in Holy Writ, and they show that formerly (when, is not said) they had a "habitation" or principality, of which they had been dispossessed, and that their power or authority included within its sphere this earth. This seems evident from what passed at the Temptation, when the devil affirmed that "all the kingdoms of the world" and "the glory of them" "had been delivered unto him,"§ an assertion our Lord did not dispute. What He objected to was to do homage to Satan, on the ground that Almighty God was alone entitled to worship, as Lord of all.‖

* S. John xii. 31, xiv. 30, xvi. 11; Ephes. ii. 2; 2 Cor. iv. 4.

† Job i. 7, ii. 2; *Ib.* i. 6, ii. 1.

‡ Jude, 6. § S. Luke iv. 5, 6.

‖ It is proper to observe that both S. Augustine and S. Chrysostom do not believe that Satan was "prince of this world" "in the sense of being lord over heaven and earth," but over "all wicked men who live in this world." This is of course true, but

The facts, then, that seem evident are—(1) that there was an original beginning, when God made the heaven and the earth; (2) that a period of desolation and ruin befell this earth; (3) that Satan was a fallen angel before the creation of man, certainly before the Fall; (4) that he was recognized by the Lord and the Apostles as the "Prince of this world," "the Prince of the power of the air";

it does not touch the question. The real point is, not that he was prince of this *present* world, but of a preceding world, that is, during "the ages," as Origen calls them, before our own. S. Augustine does not deny this; indeed he seems to support this idea when he records the opinion that the "devil was not made in that exalted nature of angels, which is super-celestial, but of a lower [grade] in the world."—Opera, t. iii. Pt. i. De Genesi, ad Lit., l. xi. n. 22.

Calmet, in giving a summary view of patristic opinion on this point, says, "Lactantius believed that there were two sorts of demons, celestial and terrestrial: that the celestial were the fallen angels, . . . and that the terrestrial were their issue, and the authors of all the evils committed on earth. . . . Jerome says it was the general opinion of the doctors of the Church, that the air between heaven and earth is filled with evil spirits. Augustine and others of the Fathers believed that the demons fell from the highest and purest region of the air unto that near the earth, which is but darkness in comparison to the serenity and clearness of the other."—Calmet's "Dict. of the Bible," article DEMON.—Taylor's edit.

The Abbé Darras, in his "History of the Church," makes the following observation:—"The fourth Council of Lateran confirmed the tradition of the Fathers and Doctors, that from the beginning God created both the angels and this world." He gives the text of the decree, of which this is a translation: "With firm faith it is to be believed that God from the beginning, out of nothing instituted at the same time angelic creatures both spiritual, corporeal, and mundane," *i.e.* inhabitants of this world.—Abbé Darras, "Hist. de l'Eglise," t. i. p. 6. Paris, 1870.

and (5) that his claim to possession of "all the kingdoms of the world" and "the glory of them" was not disputed by Christ. The conclusion to be drawn from these positions is, that in some way or other (how, we are not informed) Satan and his spirit hosts had possession of this earth, and that, by reason of their rebellion against God, they were deprived of their principality, and drew down upon themselves and upon this globe a fearful judgment, which reduced everything to a condition of chaos, the marks of which, as has been observed, remain as indelible witnesses of this tremendous catastrophe.

§ 1.

The Fall of Satan.

"There was war in heaven; Michael and his Angels fought against the dragon; and the dragon fought and his angels, and prevailed not; neither was their place found any more in heaven." * It matters not whether S. John referred to a war between Satan and God in ages long past, or whether he alludes to a war in the far future. Whichever it be, one thing is certain, that ages ago there had been a revolt, in which the rebel angels were worsted. Our Lord says as much in His observation to His disciples, "I beheld Satan as lightning fall from heaven." † What was the object of this fearful "war in heaven"? Isaiah, prophesying against Babylon, draws his prophetic picture from

* Rev. xii. 7. † St. Luke x. 18.

the great archetype of evil: "How art thou fallen from heaven, O Lucifer, son of the morning! How art thou cut down to the ground, which didst weaken the nations! For thou hast said in thine heart, I will ascend into heaven, I will exalt my throne above the stars of God: I will sit also upon the mount of the congregation, in the sides of the north: I will ascend above the heights of the clouds; I will be like the most High." * He

* Isai. xiv. 12–14. There is nothing novel in this application of the passage. Lucifer was the name of the morning star when the words quoted in the text were written; and it refers symbolically to Nebuchadnezzar, the king of Babylon, who was the great political star in the age he lived. The prophet foretells that he will aspire to compare himself with God Himself, that his pride will be so great, that he will be hurled from his exalted position to the lowest depths of degradation. "How art thou fallen from heaven, O Lucifer, son of the morning." Now, some of the early Fathers applied the passage given in the text to Satan, of whom the king of Babylon was, in respect to pride and arrogance, a fit representative. Tertullian says, in his treatise against Marcion, ". . . I have at hand a simpler answer in maintaining that it is the 'God of this world,' the devil, who once said, . . . 'I will be like the Most High: I will exalt my throne in the clouds'" (adv. Marcion, c. v., c. xi). And again, "But there is one . . . whom this Apostle well knew. Who was he? Without doubt—the Power of that air [of which he is the Prince], who has constantly raised up against the Creator Himself the children of unbelief; [even] he who declared, 'I will set my throne above the clouds: I will be like the Most High.' This is the Devil, the God and Prince of the air" (*Ib.* c. xvii.).

Pope S. Gregory the Great on the words, "The scorching wind shall carry him off, and take him away" (Job xxvii. 21), says, "Who in this place is called the 'scorching wind,' but the wicked spirit, who, by the breath of evil suggestions, excites in the hearts of the wicked earthly desires. . . . The Prophet Jeremiah testifies, saying, 'A pot kindled I see, and the face thereof by the

meditated in his heart to make war with God, to subjugate to his rule the whole of the Angelic hosts; in a word, he aspired to the very throne of the Triune God.* "There was war," therefore, "in heaven," the contending parties being Michael, the first of the Angels, together with all the hosts that remained faithful, and Satan with his followers, who joined with him in his rebellion, being composed, as some believe, of a certain number of each order in the celestial hierarchy, except that of the Seraphim.

Now the effect of this rebellion was to introduce discord in the harmony of the universe, and to disarrange, so to speak, the divine plans. The destruction of the earth before the creation, as it is commonly called, was one result of the presence of evil; for, as I have observed, it is inconceivable that God should destroy anything He had made without cause; and there could not be any other cause but one, viz. the presence of evil, and that

face of the North.' For 'the pot kindled' is the heart of man boiling over with the ferment of worldly cares, . . . which is kindled 'by the face of the North,' *i.e.* set on fire by the suggestions of the devil. For that very being is used to be called by the title of 'the North,' who said, 'I will sit upon the mount of the congregation, in the sides of the North: I will ascend above the heights of the clouds' . . ." (Moral. Job, p. ii. l. xviii. n. 32).

* It is believed by some that the fall of Satan was occasioned by his refusal to accept the decree of God respecting the Incarnation of the Second Person, and to adore Jesus Christ, when He should become very man. It may be so, but as the passage quoted in the text is generally associated with the arrogance of Satan, it it better to believe that pride and ambition were the real cause of his fall.

evil we know originated in Satan, and his subject angels. The destruction of this earth at the period I have alluded to, and its consequent reduction to a chaotic condition, without doubt disarranged the divine plans and introduced discord into heaven. No longer did the great chorus of praise ascend in strains of perfect unison, for at the same time were heard jarring sounds, the horrible yells and curses, and savage execrations of the damned angels. And besides there was the fearful gap in the Angelic hosts, the result of the apostasy and fall of myriads of spirits who once adored the Lord, but who now curse Him with bitterest invectives. The fall, then, of the Satanic hosts without doubt necessitated reparation, first, to restore the divine harmony, and secondly, to fill up, as some believe, the gaping ranks decimated by this infernal rebellion.

CHAPTER III.

THE CREATION OF MAN.

It was designed by the Lord that this reparation should be effected by means of a new race of intelligent creatures which He intended to create, and which He determined should become the inhabitants of this planet. Accordingly we read that after restoring the earth to its beauty and excellence in the course of six days, He created man, in His own image and likeness; for it is written "In the Image of God created He him, male and female created He them." * He "formed man of the dust [or slime] of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the Breath of life; and man became a living or [immortal] soul." † The man, then, whom God had called into existence, was a complex creature, having a soul composed of a spiritual substance and a body taken from matter; the two forming one person, the seat of which was in the principal part, viz. the soul. Man was then "the offspring of God," ‡ begotten, not of His substance, but by the power of His will and by adoption into the family of intelligent beings. He was then a divine creature, made in the Image and Likeness of God—a privilege which seems to have been pecu-

* Gen. i. 27. † *Ib.* ii. 7. ‡ Acts xvii. 29.

liar to our race, as it does not appear that the angels were so formed, notwithstanding that they "do always behold the face" of the Father. There must, of course, have been some reason for this, probably because of the design God had in view of Himself taking our nature, and becoming man.*

* May not this reason be, that from all eternity God intended to become Incarnate, and may it not have been the primary object of the creation of man to provide our Lord at the proper time with a Body? According to the Psalmist, as quoted by S. Basil, "a Body hast Thou prepared Me." Assuming this to be so, then there is a reason why man should be made in the Image of God. This will appear evident from a comparison of what is said about Christ with that which relates to man. Christ is described as "the Image of the invisible God, the first-born of every creature: for by Him were all things created, that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers: all things were created by Him, and for Him" (Colos. i. 15, 16; see also 2 Cor. iv. 4). Again: "Who being the Brightness of His glory, and the express Image [or Character] of His Person, and upholding all things by the Word of His power" (Heb. i. 3). And again, under the Name of the Wisdom of God, He is described as "the Brightness of the everlasting Light, the unspotted Mirror of the power of God and the Image of His goodness" (Wisd. vii. 26).

Compare these passages with those that concern man: "Let us make man in our Image, after our Likeness" (Gen. i. 26); "In the day that God created man, in the Likeness of God made He him; male and female created He them, and blessed them, and called their name Adam" (*Ib.* v. 1, 2). "He [man] is the Image and Glory of God; but the woman is the glory of the man" (1 Cor. xi. 7). The resemblance, so far as language is concerned, is remarkable. Christ is "the Image of God," "the Mirror of God," and "the Glory of God"; man, too, is described as being in "the Image of God," "the Likeness of God," and "the Glory of God." Christ was, however, something more than an image, He was very and true God, consubstantial with the Father; man, too, is more than

There can be no question that Adam was a most noble creature, unique in universal creation, and the masterpiece of the works of God. So perfect was his outward form, so surpassingly grand and beautiful his soul, so pre-eminently exalted his moral condition, that he was the object of admiration to all creation, for the heavens resounded with praise, as is thus graphically described in the book of Job: "Whereupon are the foundations thereof fastened? or who laid the corner-stone thereof; when the morning stars sang together, and all the sons of God shouted with joy?"*

Now for what purpose did God make man? and what commission did He give to him? Let us carefully note the inspired record: "And God blessed them, and God said unto them, Be fruitful and multiply, and replenish the earth, and subdue

an image, though not "very God"; for, as S. Peter says, he is "a partaker of the Divine Nature" (2 Pet. i. 4), being privileged to eat, and take into his inner self the very God that made him, by which he becomes "a member of His Body, of His Flesh, and of His Bones" (Ephes. v. 30). In all this there is a profound mystery, the depth of which we shall not understand till we arrive at the next world; but sufficient is given us to show that man possesses a character peculiarly his own. Indeed, in several places men are called "gods," that is, in a lower sense (see Exod. vii. 1), for we represent God among creatures, and have delegated to us the dominion of the world; and hereafter, we are told, we shall be like Christ, and be always with Him, wherever He is. It is reasonable, therefore, to suppose that one reason why man and woman were made in the Image and Likeness of God was, that a Body might be prepared for Christ; and hence our creation. Would that men would ponder over their high privileges and exceeding dignity more than they do!

* Job xxxviii. 6.

it: and have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over every living thing that moveth upon the earth."* Two things man was to do: first, to "replenish the earth" with creatures,—that is, creatures like himself, which he was to beget, in whom God would inbreathe with the "Breath of life," forming them into living or immortal souls. Secondly, he was to subdue the earth, that is, all that was in it, his own descendants who would become his subjects, and all that appertained to them; also every department of science connected with this globe, and the system to which it belongs; and likewise all creatures dwelling on the earth, flying in the air, or floating in the waters. All were his, and all were subject to him. Adam was the Vicar and representative of God, and it was in this character he was to act as the Master and Sovereign Ruler of the world newly restored. And in order to establish His authority, God caused all the animals He had created to be brought before him; and as their Lord and Chief, he "gave names to all cattle, and to the fowl of the air, and to every beast of the field,"†—an exercise of intelligence, be it remembered, of the highest order, which no uncultured person of modern times could possibly accomplish; for to give names is, in point of fact, to describe their nature, peculiarity of life, and their relations one to the other. Such, then, was the Father of our race, a being unique in character; for he possessed within him a divine life, essentially

* Gen. i. 28. † *Ib.* ii. 20.

distinct from all others, being the Similitude of God Himself, complex in nature, being partly of heaven and partly of earth, created for a purpose, namely, to rule over the new world.

I have taken the passages above quoted in their literal sense; but are we quite sure there is not a *prophecy* hidden under the form of a language which certainly afterwards became symbolical? The prophet Daniel tells us that "beasts" represent certain "kings"; and we know from other parts of Scripture that there is an intimate connection between the evil spirits and "the air" and "the water," here represented by the fowls and the fish. If a prophecy was intended, we have then expressed, before the Fall, but in a hidden language, to be in after years deciphered, the grand purpose of God in the creation of man, and man, too, in His Image and Likeness; viz. so to multiply themselves as to fill the earth with a race of "sons of God," and at the proper time pre-ordained, to furnish our Lord with a "Body" by which He would become Incarnate; and thus with Him, and under Him, to wage war with the evil powers, subdue the earth, and have dominion over all the "powers of the air," and of the water, and over all those terrestrial powers represented by the beasts of the field, and by those myriads of "living things that creep upon the earth." It is possible that God, when He delivered this charge to Adam, thus under prophetic language, indicated the whole purpose of man's creation, and of the scheme He had inaugurated for effecting the destruction of Satan and his evil angels. Whether the passage is to be

taken literally or mystically, or both literally and mystically, we see how exalted was the position of man in the scale of creation, destined, as he was, for some great end intended for him by God.

Who can contemplate the greatness of the divine power without falling down prostrate in adoration of the great Creator and Artificer? Who can contemplate the glory and splendour of the human race, as personified by Adam in the days of his innocence, without being profoundly impressed with the exceeding dignity of Man, formed as he was in the Likeness of his Maker, and endowed with an intelligence inferior only to the celestial intelligences? Let us then glory in our race—our divine-like race; let us fix our eyes on the divine ideal, worshipping God with all our hearts, and in profoundest adoration; for who and what are we but spirits, fallen, no doubt, but still spirits clothed with earth, in a state of probation, waiting in patience for the redemption of ourselves and for the full manifestation of the glory of God?

CHAPTER IV.

THE FALL.

It seems to be a law of God's providence that before any of His intelligent creatures shall be permitted to enjoy eternal bliss, he must pass through a season of probation. The angels had to undergo this ordeal, and, as we have seen, some of them, a large portion of them it would appear, fell in the hour of trial, and became enemies to their Lord and Master. So also man and his new-created wife, upon being placed in the garden of Eden, were commanded by God to abstain from eating of "the tree of the knowledge of good and evil," under the penalty of death on disobedience,—"For in the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die."* The happy pair (as they were then) were in the possession of a perfect free will; they had an unrestrained liberty to obey or disobey the command of God, to abstain or to partake of the forbidden fruit, and proportionate grace to enable them to choose the right course if they had been so minded. The sacrament of God's grace was provided for them under the symbol or outward form of the "Tree of Life," the fruit of which possessed power to

* Gen. ii. 17.

nourish that divine life which God had breathed into our first parents on their creation.

Let us, before we proceed, linger awhile in the garden of Eden, that Paradise of bliss where dwelt our first parents in the days of their primeval innocence. Behold a garden enclosed, endued with everything pleasant to the eye, decked with flowers of every hue, fragrant with perfumes formed from the chemistry of heaven, adorned with trees of noble dimensions, luxuriant in their golden foliage, and rich with all manner of delicious fruits of every possible variety. The ground, too, was carpeted with a verdure of the choicest flora, relieved by hill and dale and running streams, springing from lofty mountains, irrigating the land and covering it with vegetation of every sort. Then that mighty river the Euphrates, which rolled in measured billows down its onward course to the sea, branching into four other rivers, added a glory and a beauty to the whole scene impossible to describe.

And full of life was this Paradise of bliss: there was the royal lion, king of the forest, the crouching tiger, the spotted leopard, the noble horse, the faithful mastiff, the docile sheep, the humble ass (in after-days to be honoured by our Lord as its rider), all these mingled together in happy harmony, adoring in their way the Lord of Hosts, who had created them to be the servants, and, according to their capacity, the companions of man. Besides these there were the various fowls of the air, which roosted in the graceful branches of the trees in the garden, decked with brilliant and many-coloured plumage: these formed the choir of the brute

creation, offering, in sweet harmonious notes, their praises to the Most High. And then, again, the piscine families which dwell in mighty waters and murmuring rills; these added their quota to the glory of the primeval Paradise, enlivening the aquatic regions by their sports, some of which, by their sparkling gold and silver hues, relieved the darkness of the great deep. It must have been a glorious sight to the angelic hosts when they looked down into this Paradise of delights, then uncontaminated by the touch of the enemy of God, and free from the presence of all evil.

And now let us cast our eyes on the most glorious of all the works of God, the masterpiece of creation, the grandest wonder in the world, the man and the woman God had called into existence. Behold this lovely pair, endowed with every beauty that heaven and earth could bestow,—the soul the Similitude of God Himself, the body the concentrated glory of every earthly beauty and excellence. Mark the godlike intelligence of man expressed in every line of his noble brow; observe the splendour of his countenance, whereon was depicted in large measure the glory of God, stamped, as it were, with the immaculate purity of an innocence as yet unsullied by the breath of evil. See how every faculty of the mind, how every passion of the body is in beautiful accord, each subject to the will, and that will under the immediate government of their benign Lord.

And now let us, in our imagination, accompany the happy pair in their tour round their splendid domain. See them roaming about their garden of

delights, now walking along the noble banks of the great river, then sitting down in some sylvan bower, feasting their eyes on the beauty and grandeur of the ever-varied scenery around them: at one moment admiring the stupendous mountains in the distance, and at another, the gentle and peaceful valleys at their feet. Then follow them as they luxuriate among the flowers gorgeous in beauty, inhaling the sweet perfumes, and as they ramble in every direction in the heart of the dense forest, composed of trees of every possible variety of foliage, there contemplating the marvellous glories of nature in its grandeur. See them here sporting with their subject animals, which now flock around them to behold their Lord and Master, whom God had placed over them. Observe how all approach them—the Man and the Woman—with love and reverence, each in their way and according to their species, offering them the honour which was their due.

And now, sitting down under some shady giant of the forest, we behold them in a meditative mood, at one moment musing on the glories of nature they had witnessed, and at another turning their attention upon themselves, and upon each other—they seem each struck with marvel at the wondrous beauty and glory of his or her companion; for what do they perceive? not merely the perfect symmetry of the outward form, but that surpassing nobility of soul stamped upon the brow, the Similitude of the Almighty, the Triune God. And so they mused and meditated till the shades of evening approached, and then, lifting up their eyes towards

the east, they beheld a glimmer of light, which increased in volume every moment, and then a Figure became visible, august in stature, surrounded with a soft, amber-like halo of glory, and accompanied with an escort composed of bright angels, who formed as it were His court. This was the Lord Almighty, the Creator and Lord of all, who came to receive the adoration of His creatures, and to hold sweet communion with them. Oh! what joy it must have been to the innocent pair as, evening by evening, they were admitted to the visible presence of their Creator, and by Him to be embraced with all the tenderness of a loving Father. How joyously, and yet how humbly, did they prostrate themselves at His feet, offering up in holocausts their adoration, their praises and thanksgivings, for all His gracious benefits; and how supremely happy they must have been when they felt His loving Hands laid on their heads in solemn benediction! And oh! how they must have looked forward with longing impatience for the next tender and happy reunion with their august Lord and most gracious Father.

Methinks I hear you say, what nonsense you are writing, and what has this to do with your subject? Everything, my dear friend, for Paradise of old is the type of that new Paradise revealed by S. John in his Apocalypse; and the primeval innocence of the once happy pair the foretaste of what is to be in future, only in an infinitely higher degree, when man regains his long-lost innocence. It is well to contemplate our past glory, that we may estimate what we have lost, in order that we may aspire to

that which has been promised to us by our own dear Lord, who has become the second Adam. It is of use, too, in order that we may be reminded, that as Adam and Eve had one only way by which they could reach the heaven God had ultimately intended for them had they passed unscathed their probation, so is there now for us ONE ONLY ROAD by which we can possibly hope for salvation, namely, the way of the Tree of Life which has been planted by Christ for the healing of the nations. If we choose to eat of the forbidden Tree, then shall we be as gods, knowing good and evil, the end of which is death. It is then good to take a view, even if it be an imaginative one, founded upon what must have been, that we may seek the only one Truth, by which alone we can be saved.

To resume. How long this blissful life lasted is unknown; but soon, alas, all was to be changed into bitterness and grief. A dark object was observed by our mother Eve stealthily approaching to where she was reclining, somewhere near the forbidden tree, of whom it is written, he "was more subtle than any beast of the field which the Lord God had made." Looking at Eve with his beautiful fascinating eye, the serpent said, "Yea hath God said, Ye shall not eat of every tree in the garden"; and in answer to Eve, added, "Ye shall not surely die; for God doth know that in the day ye eat thereof, then your eyes shall be opened, and ye shall be as gods, knowing good and evil."* Concupiscence now took possession of our

* Gen. iii. 1–5.

mother; she looked at the forbidden fruit: it was pleasant to the eye, and desirable for making one wise; and then she consented, taking of the fruit and eating of the same. As the serpent beguiled Eve, so she in her turn seduced her husband, inspiring him with the same desire and longing, resulting in a like consent; and thus they consummated their act of disobedience.

In a moment all was changed. The soul was dead; the moral beauty defaced and corrupted; the will perverted, their nakedness became their shame; the presence of God in the cool of the evening, their aversion and dread; and their glory, the glory of their innocence gone, departed for ever, until a mediator should be found to deliver them from the curse they had brought upon themselves. Concupiscence became engrafted in their physical and moral system, which they transmitted to all their children, and their children's children, even unto the last child that shall be born. The day of their fall closed in gloom and sorrow; the Lord came as usual, to commune with the fairest of His creation, and behold! He saw before Him two abject creatures, surrounded with a Satanic atmosphere, overwhelmed with fear and trembling, and bowed down with grief and shame, for the crime they had committed. Like certain of the angels, they fell in the hour of their trial, and the instrument of their fall was the apostate archangel, who beheld with envy the creation of One who was destined to surpass in grandeur, in beauty, and in godlike excellence, all other creatures God had called into being. He

who had destroyed the harmony of heaven now introduced discord and rebellion in the new world God had formed for the man of His choice. Thus ended the first period of man's life,—his day of innocence.

CHAPTER V.

THE MISSION OF JESUS CHRIST.

SATAN and his rebel angels, having succeeded in introducing evil in the universe, in disarranging the divine works of God, in accomplishing the fall of our first parents, and reducing this world to a moral chaos, it was necessary that some great act of reparation should be made to satisfy the justice of God, and to restore all things to order, harmony, and peace.

The world, and all that is therein, was created by God, that is, by the Triune God, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, the Sacred Three, being consubstantial, co-equal, and co-eternal.

But the actual creation was the peculiar work of the Second Person: "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God . . . all things were made by Him; and without Him was not anything made that was made. In Him was life; and the life was the light of men."* And S. Paul says: "By Him were all things created, that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or prin-

* S. John i. 1–6.

cipalities, or powers; all things were created by Him and for Him; and He is before all things, and by Him all things consist."* And again: "God, who at sundry times and in divers manners spake in time past unto the fathers by the prophets, hath in these last days spoken unto us by His Son, whom He hath appointed heir of all things, by whom also He made the worlds."† The heavens and the earth, the hierarchies that dwell above in the principalities and mansions, situated in eternal space, all creatures, intelligent and non-intelligent, things visible and invisible, the millions of solar systems that illuminate "the firmament on high," all and everything, and man, His noblest work of all, were created by God, by the Word of His power, that is, by Jesus Christ, the Second Person of the Holy and undivided Trinity.

The rebellion of Satan, then, was directed primarily against the Second Person, the only begotten Son of the Father. It was the office of the Word of God, not only to create, but to give life, for "in Him was life";‡ to sustain, for "by Him all things consist";§ and to maintain each department of the universe, animate and inanimate, according to the laws He had ordained; for "by the Word of His Power" "all things" are upheld.‖ Christ, then, was the Creator, the Sustainer, and the Maintainer of the worlds, and all their inhabitants, from Whom they received the law of their being, and by Whom they received that life by which

* Col. i. 16, 17. † Heb. i. 1, 2. ‡ S. John i. 4.
§ Col. i. 17. ‖ Heb. i. 3.

they lived, and that light by which they are enlightened.

The insult, then, that was addressed to the Triune God, the defiance hurled against the court of the Holy of Holies, the war that was proclaimed against the Most High, the upsetting, so to speak, of God's plans, the introduction of evil and discord in the realms above, had to be avenged, and the restoration to perfection of all the things Satan had succeeded for the moment in destroying.

As Christ, then, was the actual Creator (so to speak), so is He the actual Restorer of all things. This we shall see further on. The first act of the Restorer, the Word of God, was the re-formation of this planet, which had been destroyed and reduced to utter ruin and darkness. The Spirit of God, whose mission seems always to prepare the way, either by His own personal action, or by means of persons whom He inspires, "moved upon the face of the waters," disposing all things, even things inanimate and dead, to obey the voice of the Lord. Then followed the command, "Let there be light," and light proceeded from Him in Whom was the light, "and light was."* The new formation culminated in the creation of man, made in the Image and Likeness of God, and endowed, by means of the Breath of God, with a soul that was immortal. There can be no doubt that the man whom Christ created in His divine capacity, as the Word of God, was intended by Him to co-operate with Him and the faithful angels in the war against Satan; and

* Gen. i. 3; S. John i. 9.

it may be premised, that had he faithfully passed through this probationary course, the Evil One, with his myrmidons, would long ago have been driven out, and perfect harmony and peace would have been finally restored. This, however, was not to be; the fall of the man Christ created still more disarranged the works of God, and further reparation and restoration had to be accomplished. And this great work likewise devolved upon the Second Person, as His own proper office as the Word and Wisdom of God. This, then, is the great mission of Jesus Christ,—the Word of God, who was "in the beginning," "by whom all things were made," who is the centre of life and light to all things, "by whom the worlds were made," who created the angelic hosts, even the very devils who rebelled against Him, and who finally called into existence man—a complex being, composed of an earthly and a divine substance, the two beings so united as to form one person, namely, "to restore all things" to their pristine excellence, and to judge and punish the devils, and such of mankind who shall refuse to become united with Him in faith and obedience. The method by which He designed to accomplish this great result I shall hereinafter consider.

CHAPTER VI.

THE WAR AGAINST CHRIST.

It will be useful now to take a summary view of that "mystery of iniquity" which commenced when Lucifer fell from his self-exalted throne, and which is now deepening in malignity and hatred, day by day and year by year, and will so continue to do until the Son of Man shall choose to destroy it. The object of this infernal war is for the dominion of this earth, and the enslavement and final destruction of man.

The liberty of Satan does not seem to have been entirely curtailed by his fall, nor does it appear that he and his companion spirits were banished from this globe. And this seems to be so from the circumstance that he was free to enter the garden of Eden, that he had liberty to parade up and down the earth, and even to enter into the very presence of God, as it thus appears from the book of Job: "Now there was a day when the sons of God came to present themselves before the Lord, and Satan came also among them. And the Lord said unto Satan, Whence comest thou? Then Satan answered the Lord, and said, From going to and fro in the earth, and from walking up and down in it."* He

* Job i. 6, 7.

seems also to have had power over the possessions and persons of men, for God, in answer to Satan's request, said: "Behold all that he [Job] hath is in thy power, only upon himself put not forth thine hand." And again: "Behold, he is in thine hand; but save his life."* In the time of our Lord's sojourn on earth we know that he and his evil spirits possessed men and women, filling them with unclean spirits, whom our Lord in His mercy frequently delivered. In a previous chapter I alluded to an incident in the Temptation, to which it is advisable to recall your attention. Upon that occasion Satan claimed to be the Lord of this world. Showing Him all the kingdoms of the world in a moment of time, he added, "All this power will I give Thee, and the glory of them; for that is delivered unto me; and to whomsoever I will I give it."† This assumption or claim, as I have observed, our Lord did not dispute or deny, as a matter of fact; what He rejected was the worship or adoration Satan demanded as the price of the donation. Christ, in point of fact, admitted the status of Satan in this world as in some sense its Ruler, for He several times called him by his title of "Prince of this world."

Indeed, it is on account of his presence here that has induced our Lord to descend and take upon Himself our nature, in order that He might, in our humanity, wage war against him for the deliverance of the world and ourselves. Since the Ascension and the outpouring of the Holy Ghost on

* Job i. 12, ii. 6. † S. Luke iv. 6.

the Church, the power of Satan has been, as a rule, limited, so far as it concerns persons who are baptized and obedient members of the Catholic Church; but in countries which have not seen the light of the Gospel, we observe he still retains his power; and in places where the true Church has been overthrown, he has recovered much he had lost.

The same thing we perceive in individuals who have apostatized, or fallen wilfully into deadly sin, whose condition has become one of abject slavery. The liberty, then, of Satan in respect to this world does not seem to have been cancelled, though within the circle of the actual Kingdom of Christ it has been limited. It seems strange to us that God had not long ago annihilated the Satanic hosts, and delivered this earth from their cursed presence; but He, in His mysterious counsels, has ordered it otherwise, and all we can do is to marvel and adore. It is evident He has so willed, and this for His own greater glory, and for the greater manifestation at the proper time of His power.

After pronouncing His curse upon Satan, our Lord addressed to him these words: "I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed: it [or she] shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel."* Two great parties were to be arrayed against each other, namely, that of the woman and her seed, and Satan and his seed: that is, the blessed Immaculate Virgin Mary and Her Seed (Jesus Christ and the Faithful),

* Gen. iii. 15.

on the one part, and Satan and his angels on the other part. This great war of "enmity" was to issue in two results,—the bruising or biting of the head of Satan, and the bruising or biting of the Heel of Christ; that is, Satan shall succeed to a certain extent in his campaign against Christ, to be followed, at the period preordained, by his final overthrow and destruction.

§ 1.

Antediluvian and Noachian Period.

After the Fall, Cain, who was regarded by Eve as a "man gotten from the Lord," and whom Satan may have mistaken for the Christ, was the object of his malignant hatred. He roused his jealousy against his brother, and Abel was worthy to become the proto-martyr of the world. Cain became the founder of the great world-power of the antediluvian age. He built the first city, and his descendants became famous in the arts and sciences. This world-power represented by Cain developed in wickedness, and the people became more and more depraved, filling the earth with abomination and scandal. They led astray the "Sons of God" (that is, as is supposed, the Faithful remnant of the servants of God), and then the apostasy became universal, followed by the Deluge.

Upon the restoration of the world, our great adversary endeavoured to destroy the family God had saved. He led Noah astray by disposing him to

the sin of inebriation; and Ham, his youngest son, whom he tempted to look on his father's nakedness. The curse of Noah fell not upon Ham, as one would have expected, but upon his youngest son, from whom sprang all those tribes which subsequently occupied the land known as Palestine and Egypt. Ham does not seem to have been cursed, although he was the delinquent, but he became the generic father of the mighty empire of Assyria and Babylon, the future persecutor of the people of God, for Nimrod, his son, laid the foundation of Nineveh, which, before the time of Moses, was a "great city."* I mention this to show how true it is that the world-power and its spirit, at all times at enmity with God, took its rise in one who was noted for crime; it was so from the commencement of the old world to the Deluge, and has continued even to the present day, in various aspects and conditions, but always for the same end, viz. the destruction of man.

§ 2.

Post-diluvian Age.

The building of the city and tower of Babel, afterwards known as Babylon, was a direct act of defiance against the authority of God. The children of Shem, Ham, and Japhet said one to another, "Let us build us a city and a tower, whose top may reach unto heaven; and let us make us a

* Gen. x. 12.

name, lest we should be scattered abroad upon the face of the whole earth." * Observe the treacherous act of the fiend, in leading the descendants of Noah into the commission of the very crime he had himself committed against the Most High, for which he was hurled from the heavens, and condemned without hope to eternal perdition. In the case of Adam and Eve he had concealed the nature of the crime he induced them to commit; but now his motive was plainly manifested, and his dupes were rushing to their destruction, fully understanding what they were about to do.

Two crimes were committed by these men: (1) their attempt to defeat the command of God delivered in the beginning to Adam, and subsequently to Noah, that they should "replenish the earth," that is, that they should go forth and people, not the locality merely in which they resided, but every part of the world. This they endeavoured to defeat by building a great city, with the intention of including within its walls the whole human race. (2) Their wicked pride and ambition in presuming to measure their strength with the Almighty, by erecting a tower, which they intended to pierce the very heavens itself. We wonder that they who must have heard of the fall of Satan, and who were also aware of the recent tremendous judgment that befell the world, could have conceived so foolish a thought as to presume to defy the power of God. Yet so it was, and being evidently possessed with the evil spirit of Satan and

* Gen. xi. 3, 4.

the world-power, they boldly commenced to execute their design. What would have been the result if they had been allowed to succeed, it would not have been difficult to forecast; it could only have been utter and complete annihilation. Before they completed their project, God interfered and confounded their language, so that they could not understand each other, and they were scattered in various parts of the world.

§ 3.

The Israelites.

Let us now consider the operation of Satan against the Israelites. His bitter malevolence was directed against this people, no doubt because he was aware they were destined to be the source of immense untold blessings to the world. Doubtless he knew that God had promised to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, that in them all families of the earth should be blessed,* and that the multitude of their descendants would be so great that they would be as countless as the dust upon the ground, as the sand upon the shore, and as the stars of heaven.† To destroy this people he put forth all his cunning and power. In Egypt, the Lord of Hosts and Satan seem, for the first time since the Fall, to have met (so to speak) in hostile array. Moses and Aaron represented the Lord Christ, and Pharaoh and the magicians the arch-fiend. The conflict was most

* Gen. xii. 3. † *Ib.* xiii. 16; xv. 5; xxii. 17.

terrible. So awful, so tremendous, so frightful, that the like has not been seen since, and it is averred, will never again occur, till the consummation of all things.

The object of the conflict was for the possession of the Israelites; they were required by Almighty God for the fulfilment of His own divine purposes; but Satan, who knew this, was determined upon their overthrow and extinction. Satan moved Pharaoh to persecute them to the death; first, by endeavouring to exterminate the race by the assassination in infancy of all the male infants.* This wholesale slaughter of infant life is, I believe, unique in diabolical conception, and it marked the importance of the struggle, and the consequent gigantic efforts made for the annihilation of the race. The Evil One was well aware that this race would be the means of his own ultimate annihilation, and hence resolved their entire destruction. In this, however, he was frustrated, and instead of the result he anticipated, they had grown at the time of Moses into a people so numerous, that at the period of the Exodus, or very soon after, there were upwards of 600,000 men fit for war.† And here we arrive at a most mysterious point: why did not God deliver His own by the natural martial prowess that 600,000 fighting men possessed? The answer, I take it, would be, that the fight was not merely a material one, but one that was spiritual and supernatural. The strife was between God on the one side, and Satan upon

* Exod. i. 16. † Numb. i. 46.

the other, and consequently the weapons were not to be, at this time at least, material swords, but the Rod of Moses and the wand of the Magicians. The Rod produced serpents, which terrified Pharaoh and his court; the wand did the same; but the Rod of Moses swallowed up those of the magicians.* Moses by the Rod turned the Nile into blood; the magicians did the same.† Then followed the plague of frogs, reproduced by the magicians, who, by their "enchantments," brought up frogs upon the land of Egypt.‡

The devil, however successful he may be in performing prodigies within the laws of nature, is absolutely powerless over matters beyond the limits of those laws. He cannot create, nor can he convert one substance into another substance, between which there is no natural or chemical affinity. To confound the magicians and to vindicate the power of God, Moses and Aaron by the Rod converted dust into lice; the magicians by their wand attempted to do the same, but could not; and they confessed to Pharaoh that "this was the Finger of God," thereby acknowledging that this miracle of the lice was beyond the power of men and devils to perform.§ Satan, however, held his own, and the battle of God continued. The plagues increased in intensity and horror, and at last God, by the mouth of His servant, pronounced the sentence of death upon the first-born of every creature in Egypt except the Israelites,‖ whom,

* Exod. vii. 10–12. † *Ib.* 19–22. ‡ *Ib.* viii. 5–7.
§ *Ib.* 16–19. ‖ *Ib.* xii. 29.

with a high hand, He delivered from the grasp of Pharaoh, angels forming the vanguard and the rear-guard of the army of God.* From the foundation of the world till now (if we except the Temptation), this is the only instance that God and Satan *met, as it were, in person* to dispute for the possession of any part of this world, or of any people. It was an awful battle, one terrible to behold, and one which has left its mark on the early national history of Egypt. In this dread encounter the Lord of Hosts was the victor, and this because of the necessity of the case, for the Israelites were the destined harbingers of untold blessings upon the future people of God.

Satan, though defeated, was not altogether foiled in his attempts to destroy this people. Like a skilful commander, he laid his plans for future operations with consummate art, and executed them with marvellous success.

The history of the Israelites is one of constant collision between the celestial and infernal powers, the object all along being the same,—the possession of the holy people, in which the latter, strange to say, seems generally successful. The faithless cowardice of ten of the spies sent to inspect the land of Canaan,† followed by the rebellion of the people in the wilderness,‡ the wicked schism attempted by Korah, Dathan, and Abiram,§ the corruption of faith and morals, the wilful deposition of the theocratic form of government for a merely secular

* Exod. xiii. 21, 22; xiv. 19, 20.
† Numb. xiii.
‡ *Ib.* xiv.
§ *Ib.* xvi.

monarchy,* the fall of Saul,† of David,‡ of Solomon,§ the revolt of the ten tribes,‖ and the apostasy of Judah, which resulted in the captivity of the former into Assyria,¶ and of the latter into Babylon, the total destruction of Jerusalem and its magnificent Temple.** Such was the work of Satan; such his success, so far, in his malignant war against the Most High.

After the restoration the same sad history is continued, culminating ultimately in the final fall and destruction of the Mosaic economy, and the dispersion of the people into all lands.††

§ 4.

The Catholic Church—the Ten Persecutions.

The third and last great period (not yet completed) of the war against Heaven commences on the day of the Nativity of our Lord. Hitherto Satan has had full liberty to do what he willed, but he was now in a measure to be restrained, at least so far as the Faithful should be concerned; that is, that while he would still be permitted to assail them outwardly, and to tempt them into sin and error, he would not (except under special circumstances) any more have the power to possess their bodies, and make use of them for his own vile

* 1 Sam. viii. 5–7.
† *Ib.* xiii. 8–14; xv. 10–35.
‡ 2 Sam. xi. xii.
§ 1 Kings xi. 9–11.
‖ 1 Kings xii. 16–33.
¶ 2 Kings xv. 29.
** *Ib.* xxv.
†† Josep., Jewish War, b. iv. c. 4–10.

purposes. With this exception, his power over men, without and within the Church, seems to remain the same. But now he has a more potent enemy to deal with than the fickle and stiff-necked Israelites. The prophecy referred to at the commencement of this chapter is now undergoing fulfilment. The predicted "Woman" has appeared; "the Seed"—the Holy Child—has been born, and the remaining "Seed," those "which keep the commandments of God and have the testimony of Jesus Christ,"* have now peopled large portions of the world. This threefold force, consisting of the Immaculate Virgin, the Holy Child Jesus, and the Faithful—*i. e.* the Catholic Church—was the Power which the adversary now directed all his art and cunning to subvert and destroy.

The holy Virgin Mother seems to have escaped his notice; probably God concealed her immaculate purity and virgin estate, in order that her glory and fame might never be sullied by even the foul breath of the arch-fiend. But he had suspicions that our Lord was something more than man, and he compassed His death by instigating the wicked Herod to massacre all the infants of Bethlehem, in the vain hope that He would be slain in the *mêlée*. Failing in this, he stirred up the malice of the Jews, the Pharisees, and the Priests, and induced the Roman Governor to co-operate in his foul design, and the result was the Crucifixion and death of Christ. The triumph of Satan was, however, of short dura-

* Rev. xii. 17.

tion, for on the third day our Lord rose from the dead, conqueror of the devil and of death. But the war nevertheless continued, and has continued with varied success against the "Woman" and the remnant of her seed who "keep the commandments of God and have the testimony of Jesus."

I need not enter minutely into the history of the operations of Satan against the Church in the world, for that would take up too much space. It will suffice if I enumerate the principal acts of the Evil One for the destruction of the Church. The assault against the Apostolate, resulting in the fall of Judas Iscariot the betrayer, the fall of S. Peter, who in fear denied his Lord, and the disbelief of S. Thomas in the resurrection. The divisions among professing Christians in the Church of the Apostolic age, which were either quelled by the Apostles, or the parties expelled from their communion.

The diabolical persecutions of the Christians during three hundred years, with scarce an intermission, of which ten were universal, that is, the whole Church persecuted at the same time. During that period the blood of the Saints ran like water in the streets of Rome, and indeed of every city of the Empire. The Church Satan hated most was the holy Roman Church, because it was the holy, immaculate, and infallible See of Peter, wherein is the Seat of authority and the Chair of teaching. Against that holy Throne all his main efforts were directed, and almost every Pontiff was a martyr, and the few who escaped death were confessors. So violent was his attack on the Cathedra of truth, that

the Popes had small opportunities, comparatively speaking, of exercising their ministry of universal pastorship.

Failing in effecting the annihilation of the Church, he sought means to corrupt her. He inspired evil-disposed men to raise heterodox questions in the Church, and hence arose the sects known in the primitive Church as the Gnostics, the Valentinians, the Marcionites, the Montanists, the Novatians, the Donatists, followed by the Arians, the Nestorians, the Apollinarians, the Eutychians, the Monothelites, &c. The object of these sects was mainly to dispute the divinity of Christ, His manhood, His two natures in one person, His two wills, His two operations; also the reality of the Atonement, some of them believing that He suffered in appearance only, that is, by a phantom body suspended upon the cross; also the impossibility of obtaining pardon for sin committed after baptism. These were the heresies of the primitive times: in later ages we read of the Greeks, who denied the procession of the Holy Ghost from the eternal Son; and subsequently of the Anglicans, who have rejected the Sacramental system of the Church, questioning baptismal regeneration, the Real Presence, denying absolutely the Sacrifice of the Altar for the living and the dead, uttering uncertain sounds respecting the Sacrament of confirmation and penance, and rejecting altogether as useless the Sacrament of unction, notwithstanding S. James's declaration concerning it.*

* S. James v. 14.

Satan has striven to rend the Church to pieces, and to set one part against another part, and to so confuse ecclesiastical matters, that it is difficult for Greeks and Anglicans to see through his artifices and to discern the one true Church of Christ, which can never be really divided into separate parts: for those who fall into heresy cease to be of the Church: "They went out from us, but they were not of us";* and though they may continue in their schism with validly-ordained bishops and priests, yet for all that they are without, forming no part or portion of the "One Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church."

Another form of attack adopted besides that of promoting heresies and schisms was most artful. Satan claimed dominion over the earth; the secular power—pagan and dechristianized—is known in Scriptures as the "Seat of Satan,"† and its Sovereign is described under the symbol of a "beast." Such Christian kings as he could lead astray, he inflated with exaggerated notions of the right divine,—under proper restrictions, a legitimate claim,—and under cover of that divine right, tempted them to usurp the Supreme Jurisdiction in ecclesiastical matters. In the early ages it took the form of seizing the franchises of the Church; in the middle ages, the investiture of bishops, by the bestowal of the ring and pastoral staff (symbols of ecclesiastical jurisdiction); and in modern times, by openly claiming the prerogative of the Supreme Headship or Governorship of the Church on earth,

* 1 S. John ii. 19. † Rev. ii. 13.

and exercising the functions of dispenser of faculties or licenses, and of that of the final Judge in all spiritual and ecclesiastical causes. Many Sovereigns—Christian Emperors of Rome, Kings of France, Emperors of Germany—have offended in these matters, but most of them were brought to reason by the enforcing of ecclesiastical discipline. None have offended so gravely, and apparently so hopelessly, as the Sovereigns of England, and in this day the Emperor of the new German Empire.

The results of the usurpation by the Crown of the jurisdiction of the Church are apparent to all who will study impartially the history of the world. The effect of the Royal Supremacy over the Church has always been to corrupt faith and morals: this we observe was the case in the East; in France, under the form of Gallicanism, by which the religion of the people was starved, preparing the way for the great Revolution. In England, the result has been to foster the false spirit of Liberalism; that is, the liberty to doubt, the liberty to dispense with the laws of God, the liberty to speak evil of dignitaries, the liberty to do that which is right in our own eyes, the liberty to promote revolutions in every country, the constitution of which we do not approve. I wish I could enter more particularly into these and other points; I should like to have dwelt more in detail respecting the operation of Satan against the Holy See, with a view of demonstrating how deep has been, and is, his malignant hatred of that sacred Chair, and of him who sits therein; manifested by violence unprecedented, by means of diabolical intrigues, by rousing up against the

Pontiffs some of the venerable brotherhood, by deceiving good men and leading them into positions antagonistic to the Chair of Peter, by setting up at various times anti-popes, &c. I should have wished also to have discussed more particularly the history of the Greek schism, and the revolt of the Anglican Church and government in the sixteenth century, when the King seized and annexed to the Crown the office of the Pontifex Maximus, so far as this Empire was concerned, but I found that each subject would occupy a volume of considerable dimensions, and so, after making the attempt, I have for the present relinquished it.

You, my dear friend, who are well acquainted with ecclesiastical history, can no doubt take into your consideration a view different to that which you have been accustomed to take. You and others have been in the habit of supposing that because Popes have been opposed by Bishops, Councils, Kings and Emperors, States and Parliaments; because there have been Popes who, as has been alleged, have issued heretical and immoral decisions *in camera* (not *in curia* or *ex cathedra*); and because there have been wicked Popes, who have scandalized the Faithful, therefore the claims of the Holy See to Supremacy over the universal Flock is founded on fraud and falsehood.

But has it never occurred to you that the Devil may have had some hand in all this? Is he not the great deceiver of mankind? Did he not cause Moses to fall when he twice struck the rock Horeb, for which offence he was not permitted to lead the people across the Jordan?

How many false prophets has he raised up against the true prophets? Was he not the cause of the schism in the house of Israel? Have there not been wicked High-priests? Did he not attempt to overthrow Christ? Was he not the cause of Peter's fall? If these were facts, can we be surprised that similar cases should have occurred in various ages in the Catholic Church: viz. that good men should sometimes go astray; that evil-disposed men should develop into heresiarchs; that councils, and even general councils, composed of a mixture of heterodox and orthodox Bishops (who had been deceived), should assemble and decree falsely; that Antipopes should be sometimes set up against the true Pope; that Kings, Princes, States, Parliaments, and even Bishops, should be induced to oppose themselves to the authority of the Supreme Pontiff—can we wonder that such things should have happened, and have caused undoubtedly scandal? Even the case of the supposed Pope Joan need not surprise any one who looks below the surface. It was the object of Satan to injure the Church, and especially its Head, in every way he could; and the supposed fact that a woman in male attire should have been ordained and elected Pope only proves the malignant hatred of Satan, who designed this outrage to bring shame and discredit upon the Holy See. You will probably ask me whether S. Cyprian, holy man and canonized saint, was deceived by Satan? Why not? S. Peter was overthrown by the devil, why may not even S. Cyprian have been led astray? Compare his language concerning the office of the

Pope, before and after his dispute with S. Stephen on the Baptismal question. Before this he addressed him respectfully and affectionately, he acknowledged his Supreme authority as the Successor of S. Peter; but afterwards, no language is too harsh or too intemperate to express the irritation burning in his mind? Is not this a true statement of the case? And if so, from whom did he get his inspiration when vehemently inveighing against the Pope? Certain it is that S. Cyprian was guilty of a most serious error, if not positive heresy, to which he, for some time at least, obstinately adhered; and having so far fallen, it was but another step to lose his temper and abuse the Sovereign Pontiff.

S. Cyprian is a fair type of many a good man who in a weak moment conceived a heresy, and then adhered to it with a pertinacity worthy of a better cause, supporting it in the teeth of authority, and even so far forgetting himself as to insult and abuse the Supreme Shepherd. These cases are no legitimate proofs against the position of the Supreme authority; rather are they proofs how men—even good men—are frequently deceived by Satan, and induced to say and do many things contrary to what is right, the object of which is—not on his own part, but on that of the devil—to embarrass and destroy the Church and the position of her Supreme authority. You should never forget—assuming that the position of the Holy See as the Head and Ruler of all Sees is a divine fact, and that its occupant for the time being is the Vicar and Representative of Jesus Christ, and armed with all His Prerogatives and Authorities as the

High-priest of the Church, and Lord of all the earth—I say, assuming this, you should never forget that the prime object of the power of evil is the destruction of that See; indeed, it is the key of the position; for if the See of Rome falls, the whole Church falls with it. You remember what S. Avitus, a Father of the fifth century, said, "If the Pope of that city [Rome] is called into question, not a bishop only, but the Episcopate, will now seem to totter."*

I would beseech you, then, to take this view of history into consideration, and I cannot but think you will perceive that the many scandals you complain of, the many difficulties which seem to you at present so insuperable, the opposition to the Popes by certain Bishops, Councils, Kings and Potentates, are proofs, not of the untenableness of the Pope's position, but of the deep malignity of the devil, who exercised all his art and cunning to overthrow that See, which *alone*, for nineteen centuries, has baffled all his efforts to corrupt the Faith of Christendom. The proof of this great fact is before your very eyes; every other Christian community in the world, the Oriental and the Anglican communions, and their offshoots, have either denied certain points of faith, or have been indifferent as to what was taught, while the holy Catholic Roman Church has withstood all heresy, and to this day holds and teaches, and enforces on all, the Faith in its integrity and in its divine fulness. The complaint of her "intolerance" is the proof of what I assert.

* Galland., t. x. Ep. xxxi. p. 724.

I maintain, then, that those attacks on the Holy See are the witnesses of its divine institution; had it been of human authority, they would have been needless, for it would have long ago succumbed to the effects of senile decay. Rome lives, and it is the monument of the Divinity of Christ, and of the unerring truth of the promise He gave to S. Peter alone: "The gates of hell shall not prevail against it," *i. e.* the Church built upon thee, O Peter, the Rock.

I have endeavoured to give an outline of Satan's policy against God, His Christ and the Church. From the beginning of all things to the Fall, from the Fall to the Flood, from the Flood to the Advent of Christ, from the Birth of Christ till now, the arch-fiend has had an extraordinary success in thwarting the divine plans, God only interfering when necessary to insure the ultimate accomplishment of His own will. The mystery of iniquity, we know from Holy Writ, will develop still further; the time will come—how soon, God only knows—when the Faith will be scarcely visible upon the earth, for so virulent will be the persecution, worse by far than ever has yet been experienced, that the numbers of the Faithful everywhere will be small. But one beacon will never be extinguished, and that is the Roman Chair of Peter, the great luminary of Christ on earth.

CHAPTER VII.

SATAN RESTRAINED.

ALTHOUGH Satan seems to have been hitherto victorious in his campaign against Christ, yet it is manifest that in every success the restraining hand of God has been visibly upon him. So far shalt thou go, and no further, is the purport of our Lord's words to Satan, as given in the book of Job, quoted in the former chapter, when He said, "Only upon himself" and "his life" "put not forth thine hand."*

In the former chapter we took a summary view of the operations of the Evil One against Christ and mankind; let us now trace the hand of God at various epochs in history, and observe how he was only permitted to advance to a certain point, but that, out of the evil done, much good to religion was the ultimate result.

1. At the period of the Deluge it was necessary, for God's divine purposes, to reserve from Satan's malice one family, in order that the human race might be preserved on the earth. During the time the Ark was building Satan was not permitted, as far as we know, to hinder the work; and while the flood was upon the earth it sailed securely,

* Job i. 12, ii. 6.

encountering no danger. The Deluge itself was a mighty demonstration of God's power, being a judgment upon the people of the antediluvian period for their gross crimes against justice.

2. Abraham, Jacob, and the twelve patriarchs and their descendants, were preserved from the destruction meditated by the Evil One until God's purposes had been accomplished. With a high hand God delivered the Israelites from the Egyptian bondage, and with a high hand He conducted them through the desert, and finally placed them as conquerors in the land of Canaan. And during the frequent falls of the people of Judah and Israel He many times intervened, so as to save them from utter ruin. For it should be remembered that the ancient people of God were created for a special purpose, namely, to provide a Mediator for the redemption of man, and to furnish for all nations a model of civil polity and sound morality; it was therefore expedient that so much of that people as were necessary should be preserved from the power of the Evil One. From Judah was to proceed Christ, in the town of Bethlehem was He to be born, and in Jerusalem, the capital of Judah and of the whole land of Israel, was it intended He should first make His triumphant entrance, and then suffer the death of the Cross; so, consequently, was it determined in the eternal counsels of God, that while ten of the twelve tribes should be scattered and lost, the principality of Judah should be maintained in its tribal integrity till those events should be consummated; in fulfilment of the prophecy, that "the sceptre should not depart from Judah, nor

a lawgiver from between his feet, until Shiloh come";* and that "out of thee [Bethlehem] shall come a governor, that shall rule My people Israel."†

And still more to demonstrate the master tactics of God, the very people He had preserved from the devil, for the accomplishment of His own divine purposes, were afterwards, in their dispersion in all lands, to become the witnesses to all people and tongues of Christ crucified, carrying, as they did, and do still, the indelible mark of Cain on their brow for the deicidal murder of their true Messiah, their Lord and King, and their elder Brother. These scattered Jews are the living witnesses of the foul crime committed nineteen centuries ago, even as Cain had been for the fratricidal murder of Abel, the first martyr. Satan succeeded in his operations against the holy people and nation, but nevertheless his very success redounded to the glory of God, and out of the vast evil have issued blessings such as the world never before received: "Great and marvellous are Thy works, Lord God Almighty; just and true are Thy ways, Thou King of saints."‡

3. The mighty hand of God was apparent during the first three centuries of the Christian era. How vehement was Satan in his efforts to exterminate the Christian religion. See how he incited the Roman Emperors, and their representatives in every part of the world, to persecute to the death Christians

* Gen. xlix. 10. † S. Matt. ii. 6. See Mich. v. 2.
‡ Rev. xv. 3.

of all ages and of every clime. See how the streets of Rome and of every large city ran with the blood of the Saints. See how churches were levelled with the ground, how all the property of the Church was confiscated, her bishops and priests exiled or murdered, and the whole flock everywhere scattered to the mountains. And how did all this end? In good inestimable. For every decimation of the faithful, hundreds were added to the Church, for the blood of the martyrs is the seed of the Church. So vast was the increase that the pagan Pliny, in his letter to Trajan, witnesses to the vast number of Christians in his day, which precluded the idea of their extermination; "for many," he says, "of all ages and every rank, of both sexes likewise, are accused, and will be accused. Nor has the contagion of this superstition seized cities only, but the lesser towns also, and the open country."*

In a word, the issue of this mighty conflict between Satan and the Catholic Church resulted in the conversion of the Roman Empire to the Cross of Jesus Christ.

4. In these efforts to corrupt the Church, success, as we have observed, attended Satan's operations to a certain point. Heretics and heresies arose in every part of the Church, except in one place. Many stars fell from the firmament of the Church; the sun was darkened with thick clouds of error; the howling winds of false doctrine vehemently disturbed the atmosphere, and vast mischief and misery

* Pliny, Epist., l. x. ep. 97, t. ii. pp. 127–9. See Horne's Int. to the Study of the Holy Scriptures, vol. i. p. 181.

ensued. How many of the scattered sheep were lost, how many folds destroyed, how many fair provinces laid waste! Alas! for the lost; but what blessings followed the attack of the enemy. Through the fall of the Jews came "salvation to the Gentiles," and "the diminishing of them, the riches of the Gentiles";* so, in like manner, the apostasies of men are the causes of salvation to the Faithful, and their loss, the riches of the people of God.

It seems to be a principle inherent in the operation of good and evil, that the fall of men results in the enlightenment and confirmation of those who stand in the firmness of God. Had no heretic ever arisen to shock the conscience of the Church, had no error ever disturbed the unity of the faith, how elementary and how crude (if I may so speak with respect) would have been our Creed? The Church was intended to grow, from infancy to youth, to the fulness of a perfect man, as S. Paul so graphically informs us in his Epistle to the Ephesians.† How was this perfection to be attained? By these very insidious assaults, which Satan directed against the doctrine of the Church, with the view of corrupting her faith and morality.

His first attempt was to question the divinity of Christ. He roused up men who ventured to assert that He was indeed God, but nevertheless a creature, for they held that there had been a time when the Son of God had no existence. This error was gene-

* Rom. xi. 11, 12. † Ephes. iv. 16.

rated by the Gnostics, and afterwards developed by the Arian sects, until the Catholic Church anathematized them, and asserted the co-eternity and consubstantiality of the eternal Son with the Father. Then followed errors respecting His human nature, the confusion of the two natures, the denial of His separate wills as God and man, and of the two operations,—each of which were in like manner determined by the promulgation of the divine maternity of the ever-blessed Virgin Mother of God,—and the two distinct and separate natures of the God-Man, united in One person, never to be divided; the Divine possessing intact His will as God and the Human His will as man, and the consequent operations respectively following the volitions of those two distinct wills. From the heresies of Arius, Nestorius, Eutyches, &c., evolved the great dogmas of the Divinity and the Incarnation of Jesus Christ, very God and very Man. Then followed the heresies concerning the Holy Ghost, which were condemned by the first Œcumenical Council of Constantinople, when the clause, "I believe in the Holy Ghost, who proceedeth from the Father," was added to the Creed. But this did not exhaust the whole truth, as it was afterwards discovered. Questions arose as to whether He proceeded from the Son as well as from the Father. It was maintained by those who denied the truth, that to proceed from both was to assert two originals or sources; that, as the Father was the origin of the Son, so He was the origin, to the exclusion of the Son, of the Holy Ghost. This error was, in point of fact, a branch of the heresy

of the Arians, which consisted in the denial of the identity of substance between the Father and the Son, whereas they were of one substance and consubstantial; and the Holy Ghost being very God no less than the Father and the Son, was likewise of one substance, and consubstantial with both the Father and the Son; that is, there are three distinct Persons and one God, possessing one eternal, self-existing life, with one will and one operation. Hence, then, the Holy Ghost proceeded from both Father and Son,—not as from two substances, but from one substance, by the volition of one will, and this from all eternity, for He is co-equal, co-eternal, and consubstantial with both the Father and the Son. To destroy this heresy, and to make clear the true doctrine, the Catholic Church added the "Filioque Clause," and consequently she confesses that "the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father and the Son." The Oriental Church, however, would never admit of this addition, and for one very good reason; viz. that Arianism was never entirely eradicated from them; but the Holy Ghost had spoken to the conscience of the Church, and as soon as confirmed by the Vicar of Christ, was accepted by the Faithful throughout the world.

The whole doctrine of the Blessed Trinity, and the Divinity of the eternal Son and of the Holy Ghost, which Satan had craftily assailed by heresiarchs and heretics, was now fully developed and established as dogmas of the Catholic Church.

The next position assumed by our arch-enemy concerned the Blessed Sacrament. Berengarius,

Archdeacon of Angers, taught that the Bread and Wine were not changed by consecration into the Substance of the Body and Blood of Christ, thereby denying, if not intentionally, at least in effect, the doctrine of the Real Presence. This heresy was quashed by three Councils celebrated at Verceli, at Paris, and afterwards at Rome, where the term Transubstantiation was employed for defining the nature of the Real Presence.

This controversy was revived at the "Reformation," when Anglican divines, under Cranmer, reopened the heresy and made it the law of England. No doubt the general acceptance of this heresy by the English, and the same, under another form, by the Germans, and in a still lower degree by the Calvinists, was a grievous blow to the Catholic Church, being a scandal equal in malignity, but more serious in its consequences, than the great Arian heresy; yet are we indebted to these heretics for the very beautiful and exhaustive series of canons of the Œcumenical Council of Trent, setting forth the true faith respecting the Real Presence. The whole doctrine concerning our Lord's Person, His Two Natures, &c., and his Real Presence in the Blessed Sacrament, was now finally and for ever determined.

There were two other great questions which arose in the sixteenth century, the Immaculate Conception of our Lady, and the position of the Sovereign Pontiff in the Catholic hierarchy. It had always been held in the Church that our Lady was immaculately conceived, that is, that at the moment of the infusion of her soul into her body

the soul was, by a special privilege, exempted from the taint of original sin. When upon earth, the Blessed Virgin was protected by Almighty God from the artifices of the devil, and from the insults of the enemies of Her Son.

It was reserved for Christians of the last three centuries to insult and revile her. Satan, who knew her power with God as the Mother of God, determined to abolish, if he could, the *cultus* which is due to her. The Anglicans expunged her feasts from the calendar, the Ave Maria was struck out of the service books and out of every book of private devotion. Our Lady's name ceased to be remembered, except as the name of an historical personage. She was regarded as an ordinary woman, who was employed in her virgin estate to conceive and bring forth the Son of the Highest, and after having performed this duty, lived with her husband as an ordinary wife. This was the belief common in the Anglican Church when you and I were children, and it is still the opinion of those who do not belong to the High Church or Ritualist parties. The result of this attack upon our Lady's fame has been the promulgation by his present Holiness, whom God long preserve, of the dogma of the Immaculate Conception, and hence a clearer understanding of her real position in the economy of grace, as the Great Mother of God and Queen of Heaven.

So also with respect to the position of the Supreme Pontiff of the Catholic Church. In all times and in all places, and by every one of the Faithful from S. Peter to the period of the Greek schism, it was

acknowledged that to S. Peter had been delivered the Keys, and the government and guardianship of the whole Universal Church, and that this Prerogative descended to all his Successors to his Chair; but it was the object of the civil power, either to annihilate his position, or, failing in this, to weaken and neutralize his power. Satan, by means of the old pagan Emperors, let loose all his fury against the Popes of the Holy See; for three hundred years, every Supreme Pontiff, save two or three, were martyrs. Failing in these manœuvres, he produced a multitude of schisms in various parts of the world, followed by the Greek schism in the twelfth, and the German and English in the sixteenth centuries. Every argument was used to prove that the papal power was an usurpation, and Scripture was wrested to show that the Pope, though admitted to be a good person, was nevertheless, officially, "the man of Sin," "the Apostate one," "the Antichrist," &c.; and by a clever manipulation of the writings of the Fathers, and the acts and decrees of Councils, to prove that the Papacy had no existence in the early ages. But the spirit of evil was foiled by the very weapon he employed. The Press which circulated falsehood circulated likewise Truth, and hundreds of his deluded followers began to discover how their forefathers had been deceived. Do not think me uncharitable when I assert, without fear of any well-founded contradiction, that the "Reformation" was a gigantic imposture founded upon fraud, and carried into effect by a violence that has its parallel only in the bloody ages of infant Christendom.

Grievous indeed has been the harm in many a fair fold of Holy Church by reason of these violent proceedings of men, whose inspiration has certainly not been drawn from heaven. And yet God has not failed to bring good out of the moral chaos.

Long ago has the Pontiff provided Shepherds for the wasted places in the East, and within the memory of living men the Catholic hierarchy has been established in the United States, some of the Colonies, and in England. The fruits of this movement are even now apparent; the Light, though never actually extinguished, is becoming more and more brilliant; the ancient Catholic families, and such of the people who had kept the faith, are emerging from the darkness of obscurity, and hundreds and thousands of Protestants of every sect are at this time watching with keen interest the sacred luminary now visibly shining in the watchtowers of holy Zion.

The Holy Father, so long reviled, is now seen by religious thinkers as the true and faithful Father, who, through good and evil report, has boldly and unflinchingly stood his ground, and by his stern fidelity and truthfulness has proved demonstratively his own real position as the Shepherd of Shepherds, the Teacher of Truth, and the one Vicar of Jesus Christ, to whom has been consigned, as the Council of Chalcedon long ago said, "the guardianship of the Vineyard by the Saviour." But to destroy for ever all subterfuge, the Holy Ghost has now affirmed, through the Vatican Œcumenical Council, the Infallibility of the Supreme Pontiff when defining *ex-cathedra* questions concerning Faith and

Morals. This has been well described as the apex of the edifice of divine truth, the keystone of the Arch, which preserves in integrity every part of the divine economy of grace. The rage of the infernal hosts has been too apparent for any one, who thinks religiously at all, for a moment to doubt, how keenly they have felt the force of this decree. The seizure of the Eternal City, the deposition of the Pope from his temporal throne, the confiscation of the religious houses, and the violence of the German Imperial Government, are proofs too clear for every Catholic at least to dispute. The very violence of the world, following so closely on the promulgation of this decree, itself proves that the keynote of the chord in the celestial and ecclesiastical lyre had been struck by the Holy Ghost, the effect of which has been to produce perfect harmony in universal Catholicism, and at the same time to rouse to its utmost pitch the rage and fury of the enemies of the true Religion.

But no Catholic fears the result. When the modern German Empire and its miserable sub-Alpine satellite shall be things of the past, the Catholic Church will be triumphant, and her Supreme Pontiff again Sovereign of the Eternal City and of the States of the Church. The darkest page in ecclesiastical history was without doubt in the sixteenth century. The fall of the Greek Church and of the Greek Empire unquestionably was the cause of the dominancy of Mahometanism; but I question whether Mahometanism was so deadly in its effects as Anglican Protestantism. The creed of Mahomet was simple indeed: "God is God, and Mahomet

is his prophet." Every Christian knew what this meant; if he joined that body he knew he was abjuring Christianity, and committing an act of shameful apostasy. His blood was on his own head, and no one else could share with him in the responsibility of his act and deed. But not so in Protestant England and Germany.

The quarrel between Henry and the Pope was not merely personal; it was not a case only of disputed rights between the Regale and the Pontificate; it was not simply a question of boundaries between the jurisdiction of the civil sword and that of the ecclesiastical Keys of spiritual power. It was a case, in the first instance, of a revolt of the king (not of the nation) against the Pope. Elizabeth completed the work of Henry, and so well did she perform her task that she succeeded in deceiving, not only the English of her day, but the English of three centuries afterwards.

So artful and so cleverly cunning was her mode of procedure, that she was able to impose upon learned men to such a degree as to induce them to swear their assent and consent to every word in the Prayer-book, and to the plain grammatical sense of the Articles of Religion, two documents contrariant to each other in vital points of faith. And further to enable her to carry out effectually her policy, she made it appear to the English mind that some great treason had been committed by the Catholic clergy, which was necessary to put down, with which the saying of Mass was somehow connected; and hence an act of Parliament was passed which provided that every priest saying

Mass should be guilty of high treason, and consequently should suffer death.

By these subtle methods Queen Elizabeth, with the able assistance of her tools, both civil and ecclesiastical, succeeded in cheating the people of England out of their faith; and thus the seed was sown which has issued in that terrible reign of Liberalism that is even now master of America and Europe. Mahometanism has deceived no one, its attack was open and direct, and every one knew what it signified; not so with the so-called Reformation, which was insidiously and in a devilish manner introduced into the English mind, by which they were deceived and enslaved, and made, without their own knowledge, the propaganda of Liberalism over all the world.

But the hand of God was and is on the spirit of evil, both in this and other lands; a sacred remnant has ever remained of the true faith. The succession of the holy line of Priests has never been absolutely broken, the holy sacrifice of the Mass has never been entirely suspended, the lamp of the sanctuary has never been wholly extinguished, for it still flickered in some few solitary and obscure places, and the confessional has never been without a penitent. The Priests of the Lord were in hiding; under the garb of rough labouring men they traversed the land, the Blessed Sacrament carefully hidden within the folds of their inner clothing, visiting the abode of the faithful, comforting them in their miseries, imparting spiritual life to the half-destitute, relieving the conscience of many long unshriven, and raising the courage of the

timid. How often did the stately personage, standing behind the chief of the family at the principal meal, conceal the Priest of the Most High; and how frequently from under his disguise did he recognize many an unwelcomed guest, who would only have been too rejoiced to have pocketed some few hundred pounds by delivering him up to the nearest parish constable. Yes, those noble priests fought the battle of God, and preserved the sacred deposit within the land.

But they did more. Not only did they sow the seed, but they watered it plenteously, that it might some day grow into a stately forest. Yes, they watered it copiously, and with their own blood. For a hundred years, the persecution begun by Elizabeth and finished under Charles II., was unabating. Priest after priest, and layman too, were dragged to prison, tortured with a barbarity and cruelty even in that age excessive; and then brought to the gallows and hanged, not, however, till death put an end to their agony, but while life was in them, and before the nervous system was exhausted and benumbed, the butcher-executioner deliberately disembowelled them, and at the same time tore out their still beating hearts, to exhibit them to the bloodthirsty Protestants of the time.

This is no exaggeration of what occurred hundreds of times upon the bodies of the faithful Catholics of Christ, the faithful remnant of the true English Church of S. Augustine of Canterbury. It is true to the very letter. The seed was well watered; the sapling is now growing steadily and healthily, and already it is yielding seed after its kind, and

soon we may look forward to a bright future. The English people, mind, had nothing to do with the proceedings of Henry, Edward, Elizabeth, James, and the first and second Charles. Indeed, it is only within the last forty years that they possessed a real parliament at all, and only within the last four or five years has the franchise been so extended as to enable the great bulk of the people to vote for members of Parliament. Their responsibility commences from this time. If they are still so stupid as to believe in the lies of former days, as to trust to an effete Protestantism; if they refuse to acknowledge the sacred truths of the Gospel; if they will persist in shutting their eyes to the plain testimony of Holy Scripture to the Supremacy of Peter over the whole Church, well then, their blood must be upon their own heads, and their fate will be similar to the fate of all other nations who have rebelled against God and His Church.

But another witness in the British Empire has God preserved; that is, the island of Saints and Martyrs—I mean the children of S. Patrick.

Before England was born into the family of nations, Ireland was an autonomy, recognized as such by contemporary races. When Albion was inhabited by a barbarous and savage people, Ireland was in the height of prosperity. When the Anglo-Saxons were tearing each other to pieces, Ireland possessed a settled government, and was administered by wise laws, so ancient, that no one knows precisely the period of their first promulgation. When this country was remarkable for its ignorance and brutality, Ireland was celebrated for her culture

and civilization. When S. Augustine was preaching to the heathen, when Ethelbert was receiving baptism, when Alfred was a wanderer, Ireland was sending forth her missionaries all over the world, spreading everywhere the Gospel and civilization. When the foundations of the Universities of Cambridge and Oxford were laid, the colleges of Ireland had long been flourishing seats of learning, imparting to all who came to her schools knowledge and truth. Ireland can assert, what no other existing kingdom or state can say, that her history is lost in the mazes of antiquity, and that her era of barbarism belongs to pre-historic times.

About the eighth century the troubles of Ireland began, by the invasion of the Danes, and the subsequent wars that raged within the island. Taking advantage of this state of things, the Norman English invaded Ireland under Henry II. and annexed it as part of his dominions. It would appear that after so much early prosperity Ireland was to enter the school of suffering, in order that, by severe trial, she might become again the great witness for Truth, when darkness should once more cover the earth.

The dark hour is approaching, the twilight of civilization has long passed, and the midnight of Satanic barbarism is at hand, under the evil influence of which many shall fall to rise no more. The boasted civilization of this latter half of the nineteenth century is a delusion; it is barbarism veiled by a cloud illuminated by a light, the source of which is neither in heaven nor in the Church.

When men care no longer for truth for its own sake, then a shadow has fallen upon the soul. When people in high places regard truth and untruth as a matter of indifference, darkness has enveloped the soul, so that it can no longer distinguish between right and wrong. When scepticism and infidelity have taken hold of the mind, then indeed has the light become darkness. And when indifference to the dictates of the moral law, when impurity and sensuality are openly tolerated by society, then the conscience has become seared; and when murder—brutal murder and infanticide—flagrant dishonesty in business, and when the first principles of socialism and communism prevail, then the era of barbarism has indeed commenced.

Let England look to herself, and reform her ways before it be too late. The cloud is upon her now; it is even ready to burst, and to pour down upon her calamities too appalling for adequate expression. I am not prophesying, I am only stating that which every thinker knows, but does not dare plainly to express. In England faith is gone, morality at a very low point, and crime in the ascendant. Of all the nations constituting the British Empire, there is one, and only one, wherein the Luminary of Faith and Truth, notwithstanding all the sufferings inflicted upon that poor oppressed land, still shines resplendent, and wherein the silver light of personal and domestic purity still glitters with unsullied excellence and glory.

It has been the fashion of the English to mock at Irish intemperance and at Irish vindictiveness. We are all children of Adam, we are

all prone to evil, and all of us have our besetting sins, and nations, too, have their failings as well as their virtues. It is not for England to point the finger of scorn at Ireland; it is not for England, in her self-complacency, to say to Ireland, "Sister, Let me pull out the mote out of thine eye," for "behold a beam is in her own eye."* England, superior in power and earthly glory, enjoys a primacy in vice too shocking to contemplate. For every drunkard and murderer in Ireland there are many in England. Murderers in Ireland are agrarian, in unholy vengeance for deep wrongs inflicted, whereas in England the murders are cold-blooded, atrocious, and barbarous. Baby farms and infanticide are unknown among the Irish, while in England they abound. It is a fact which none can gainsay, that after making due allowance for frail human nature, and for the deep irritation engendered by sufferings inflicted by England, no country in the world can present a cleaner bill of spiritual and social health than the famous Emerald Isle.

Has Ireland suffered, you will ask, from the hands of England?† Indeed she has. She suffered because she would never yield to the wicked demands of England, by denying her religion, and accepting in its place the creed of Queen Elizabeth,

* S. Matt. vii. 4.

† I exclude Scotland, for Scotland formed no integral part of the United Kingdom till A.D. 1708, when the two nations were united by act of the two national and independent Parliaments. Whatever may be the faults of our country, she, as a nation, had nothing to do with the oppression of Ireland.

Cromwell, and William III. Nobly has she suffered, gloriously has she passed through the fiery ordeal, and victory is stamped indelibly on her brow. When the wretched Anglican episcopate yielded to the royal demand of Supremacy over the Church, the Irish Hierarchy stood firm in the Faith, and refused to consent to their own degradation. When nobles, gentry, and people on this side of the water ignobly followed the apostasy of their Princes, and that for a mess of pottage, the Irish grandees and aristocracy of Irish descent stood their ground, and yielded up lands and rank rather than do so execrable a deed. Men of high birth, well-born, and tender women unused to hard toil, were driven to wander up and down the land till opportunities offered themselves to enable them to escape to the more friendly continent; and strange to say, the present chief of the French nation—Marshal MacMahon—is the representative of one of those illustrious exiles, whose ancestor refused to barter his faith for the favour of the English monarch.

The persecution against Catholic Ireland was terrible, scarcely surpassed in atrocity during the worst days of the pagan Roman Empire.* Wives

* To give an idea of English policy towards Ireland, I extract the following from a most interesting "History of Ireland" by M. F. Cusack :—

"(1) The Catholic peers were deprived of their right to sit in Parliament. (2) Catholic gentlemen were forbidden to be elected as members of Parliament. (3) It denied all Catholics the liberty of voting, and it excluded them from all offices of trust, and indeed from *all remunerative* employment, however insignificant. (4) They were fined £60 a month for absence from the Protestant form of

and younger children were encouraged to inform against the Catholic heads of their respective families, with a view of obtaining their lands and property. It was contrary to law for a Catholic to possess property. The Priests were hunted as if

worship. (5) They were forbidden to travel five miles from their houses, to keep arms, to maintain suits at law, and to be guardians or executors. (6) Any four justices of the peace could, without further trial, banish any man for life if he refused to attend the Protestant service. (7) Any two justices of the peace could call any man over sixteen before them, and if he refused to abjure the Catholic religion, they could bestow his property on the next of kin. (8) No Catholic could employ a Catholic schoolmaster to educate his children; and if he sent his child abroad for education, he was subject to a fine of £100, and the child could not inherit any property either in England or Ireland. (9) Any Catholic priest who came to the country [Ireland] should be hanged. (10) Any Protestant suspecting any other Protestant of holding property in trust for any Catholic, might file a bill against the suspected trustee, and take the estate or property from him. (11) Any Protestant seeing a Catholic tenant-at-will on a farm which, in his opinion, yielded one-third more than the yearly rent, might enter on that farm, and, by simply swearing to the fact, take possession. (12) Any Protestant might take away the horse of a Catholic, no matter how valuable, by simply paying him £5. (13) Horses and waggons belonging to Catholics, were in all cases to be seized for the use of the militia. (14) Any Catholic gentleman's child who became a Protestant, could at once take possession of his father's property."—"Hist. of Ireland," by M. F. Cusack, pp. 576, 577. Longman, Green, & Co. Lond. 1872.

In Hume and Smollett's "History of England," the following observation concerning Lord Capet, the Lord-Deputy when these atrocious laws were passed, is noteworthy: "Lord Capet, the Lord-Deputy, governed in a very partial manner, oppressing the Irish Papists, without any regard to equity or decorum" (vol. ix. p. 164. Lond. 1825).

they were vermin, from town to town, and from hamlet to hamlet, the Protestant dogs being sent after them to worry them to death. How many Priests and laymen were slaughtered by authority of the English Government will probably never be known till the day of Judgment, when we shall see them standing near the great "White Throne," their brows encircled with the rubied diadem of martyrdom. No Christian land since "the memory of man" has endured such terrible suffering, such inhuman treatment, such flagrant injustice as the noble Irish people, and this by a Government professing to be the most religious and the mildest upon earth!

And in the midst of this murderous persecution Ireland has stood as firm as a rock; the winds have beaten upon her aged bulwarks, but in vain; the floods even sought her deep foundations to undermine them, but in vain; the whole weight and power of the Empire has striven to bend her noble neck to the iron despotism of a cruel and heartless policy, but glorious Ireland, notwithstanding her weakness and her prostration, has baffled her; for there is One who watches over her, whose name is the God of Justice, and One who fights for her, and protects her from that destruction and annihilation which England for many centuries has attempted, but in vain.

It is in no spirit of disloyalty that I, who am not an Irishman, write these words; I enter not now into the arena of party politics, I am not now considering whether "Home Rule" is a wise or an unwise proposal, I advocate not the

dismemberment of the Empire—God forbid—nor do I assert that the present Protestant aristocracy and proprietors should be disturbed in their possessions, notwithstanding the fact that for the most part they were originally obtained by injustice and fraud; but this I do venture to assert, that if England knows, I will not say her duty to God and man, but her own interest, she will henceforth regard Ireland as a loving sister, and no longer as a conquered slave. Let us remember that Ireland is essentially a Catholic country, and that it is her right to be governed on Catholic principles. Talk not of conscience: a nation which recognizes the Hindoo religion for India, which tolerates the Episcopal form of Christianity in England and the Presbyterian in Scotland, besides sects without number, some of which do not believe in the Divinity of Christ, cannot plead conscience as an argument for refusing justice to Ireland. To do so would be the very depth of the vilest hypocrisy. Treat Ireland as a Catholic country, and Ireland will give her strength and her glory to the increase of the honour and splendour of the British Empire.

And England, too, may learn a few lessons from her long-despised Irish people. In the religious and moral order, England must perceive that the fruits of the so-called Reformation have never proceeded from a good tree. In Ireland you see a people true to their faith, holy in their lives, and virtuous in their conduct: from whence these fruits? Not from the Reformation, not from the late Established Church, not from the Dissenters, but from the Catholic Church, to which, notwith-

standing the iron policy of persecuting England, she has remained true and faithful even unto death. Ireland, renowned in her ancient history, glorious during centuries of suffering, has without doubt a splendid future. She has not decayed by time, nor has she been demoralized by suffering: she is, like the Church, still young and vigorous, possessing within her a soul which no human power can break. Even now she has a vast moral empire, for her people are spreading everywhere, carrying with them their religion, their morality, and their virtues.

She is furnishing witnesses of the Truth of God in every city of England and Scotland, in the great cities of American and Australian civilization, and even on the Continent she is not unrepresented. When the apostasy of Europe is consummated, the children of S. Patrick will be lights shining in dark places, cheering the faithful remnants, encouraging the disconsolate, attracting to themselves the weary wayfarer and the benighted traveller, who had for a long time lost themselves in the labyrinths of doubt and unbelief, struggling in the mire of abomination and wickedness. It seems, then, that in these last days, Ireland and the Irish are the people especially chosen by God to fight the good fight of Faith against the infernal powers of hell; and let them take courage with the thought that their fidelity to the Faith is a pledge of their future glory, and that their patience in the school of suffering, through which they have now nearly passed, has been their earthly purgatory, to fit them for the work for which Ireland seems to be destined by Almighty God.

In the preceding chapters I have endeavoured to give a summary of the principal points of importance in the history of the great war that has been raging between the powers of good and evil, from the remotest antiquity till now. As I have said before, to do more was impossible. It is open to you to take any one point and study it carefully and thoroughly, and I think you will find that the remarks I have ventured to make will in the main be found correct. I propose in succeeding portions of this Epistle to investigate more particularly the divine plan, as far as it has been revealed, for effecting the destruction of the power of Satan, and the redemption of man from the slavery and death occasioned by the Fall.

BOOK III.

THE PREPARATION.

CHAPTER I.

THE DIVINE PLAN.

God having determined upon effecting the destruction of Satan and the redemption of the world by a slow and gradual process, rather than by an instantaneous exercise of His Omnipotence, it is reasonable to suppose, especially as this earth was, is, and ever will be till the consummation, the theatre of war between heaven and hell, that He intended to employ for this end the ordinary forces of humanity, to be assisted and guided by spiritual agencies, by the operations of His Providence, and also by direct revelation of His will through certain inspired persons chosen for this purpose.

It is an error to suppose that the Fall of man was destructive of all good in him. It did not deprive him of the moral force of conscience: this is evident in the case of both Adam and Eve; they knew they had fallen; they did not, like Satan, boldly confront the Almighty, but "they hid themselves."

They did not expose their nakedness before Him, as Lucifer, in his pride and arrogance, but they clothed themselves with garments, to express their shame; and when summoned by God into His Presence, Adam said: "I heard Thy voice in the garden, and I was afraid, because I was naked; and I hid myself."* Then he and his wife confessed their sin, and received the promise of future mercy and pardon, accompanied, however, with a lifelong penance.

The Fall, then, did not transform our first parents into reprobates; it did not deprive them of that law of conscience implanted within them, as S. Paul witnesses, when he says: "For when the Gentiles, which have not the law, do by nature the things contained in the law, these, having not the law, are a law unto themselves: which show the work of the law written in their hearts, their consciences also bearing witness, and their thoughts the meanwhile accusing or else excusing one another."† Nor did the Fall destroy in our race all virtue; the fact that man possessed a law of conscience within him demonstrates that he still possessed the faculty of discerning good from evil, and consequently the desire of following either a path of virtue or a course of wickedness. Cain knew that he had committed a crime against God in the murder of Abel; and Lamech likewise, who had similarly transgressed, but in a sevenfold measure. Nor, again, were the intellectual powers *radically* impaired by Adam's sin: injured, no

* Gen. iii. 7–12. † Rom. ii. 14, 15.

doubt they were, as every other department of his nature, but not to such an extent as to render him unfit for the various vocations he would have to fill.

Indeed, it is a remarkable fact that the power of intellect was in the earliest ages exhibited for the most part in wicked families, such as the descendants of Cain in the ante-diluvian, and of Ham and his descendants in the post-diluvian periods of the world. And even in this day the worst characters and the most pestilent heretics are often remarkable for talent of the highest order. In truth, the results of the Fall of man show themselves more in the corruption of our moral nature than in any deterioration of our physical and intellectual condition. Original sin consists of that law of concupiscence which S. Paul describes as a "warring" within ourselves between good and evil, doing what we would not, and not doing what we would; so vividly did he feel this, that he exclaimed, in mingled anguish and joy, "O wretched man that I am! who shall deliver me from the body of this death? I thank God through Jesus Christ our Lord. So then with the mind I myself serve the law of God; but with the flesh the law of sin."*

Man, then, not being wholly bad, and being still gifted with intelligence, and still possessed of the law of conscience within him, it seems that the sacred Three resolved to effect his redemption and the annihilation of Satan with his wicked

* Rom. vii. 24, 25.

hosts, by means, chiefly, of his co-operation, that is, by the use of those moral and intellectual forces with which he is endowed, under the guidance of the Holy Ghost, and with the powerful assistance of the holy angels. As the "Spirit of God moved on the face of the waters," in preparation for the renewal of the old world from chaos, so did the Spirit of God move upon the waters of pre-Christian times, preparing them—that is, the peoples of the world—for the coming of the Son of Man in the latter days; and for the expulsion of that deep, impenetrable darkness that enveloped the earth, which should be accomplished when the command should go forth anew, "Let Light be"; and when "Light was," in the person of Christ, the true "Light of the world," and of that "City" which He should set upon a hill to give Light to all around.

The design of God, then, was to accomplish the redemption of man, not by a sudden and instantaneous operation of His Omnipotence, but by a gradual process of development, raising man by degrees from his fallen condition, leading him up, step by step, to that position that would fit him for the reception of those wondrous truths in store for him. It is not the will of God ordinarily to interfere with that law of nature He has established. A person who has been accustomed to a dark room for years cannot endure a sudden change to light. A man long afflicted with insanity cannot all at once be restored to perfect sanity. Place before him in such a condition a book requiring considerable thought, the consequence would

be a relapse. So it has been ordained by God, in accordance with all those principles of our human constitution, that the redemption of the human race should be wrought out in the manner I have described, the human mind and conscience undergoing such a gradual training as would result in its being fitted to bear the "Light of the world," and the brilliancy of that "Great City," which should appear at the proper time. The glimmerings of this "Light" were apparent long before the first Advent. A feeble ray was vouchsafed to Adam and Eve, after the Fall, in the memorable prophecy of the "Seed" then to be: a stronger ray, some two thousand years afterwards, was presented to the vision of Abraham when God said to him, "In thy seed shall all the families of the earth be blessed." Further indications were given to Jacob, to Moses, and David; but the glimmerings of the Light, like the aurora borealis in the northern skies, began to play in luminous waves of amber glory in the prophecies of the evangelical prophet. In this manner was man to be trained for the acceptance of the great truths, which, in the ages to come, were to be unfolded to his view in all their glorious splendour.

CHAPTER II.

THE PREPARATION.

In the mysterious counsels of God it required a period of four thousand years, according to the vulgar computation, to prepare the world for the coming of Christ and for the establishment of His universal Empire. This preparation consisted of a regimen of moral discipline for the advantage of the soul; of the cultivation of the arts and sciences, for refining the mental faculties and for the civilization of the whole man; and of law, using the term in its proper sense, for the discipline of peoples.

§ 1.

Moral Discipline.

As I observed in the last chapter, the principles of the moral law were engrafted in the conscience of man, which was the witness within him between God and himself. The whole moral law consists in obedience to a law imposed upon man by Almighty God and written in his heart. Adam received one command, viz. that he was not to eat "of the Tree of Knowledge of Good and Evil," but he was permitted to eat of all other trees, inclusive of the Tree of Life. Morality, strictly speaking, consists

in innocence, that is, ignorance of evil. Once a man knows evil, he ceases to be innocent, in the strict sense of the term. The Tree of Life was a symbol of innocence; the Tree of Knowledge of Good and Evil, of evil. The sin of Adam and Eve lay in their desire to know and taste what was forbidden: that is concupiscence. The sin was in eating, that is, receiving within them what had been prohibited; and that which they voluntarily, and of their own free will, received was the acquisition of a knowledge and a power which God had denied them. This knowledge and power were thus described by Satan: "For God doth know that in the day ye eat thereof, then your eyes shall be opened, and ye shall be as gods, knowing good and evil";* and this saying of the Evil One was confirmed by God Himself, when He said: "Behold the man has become as one of Us, to know good and evil";† therefore it is true that Adam actually received, really and truly, a knowledge of good and evil, and thus he became in a sense "one with God" in this knowledge.

And we are further told that, had he been allowed to stretch forth his hand to take and eat of the fruit of the Tree of Life, he would have become Immortal, that is, "live for ever."‡ This was not to be, and to prevent this additional profanity God expelled the guilty pair, and guarded the entrance to the garden by sentries of cherubim, to "keep the way of the Tree of Life."§ Man, then, being possessed, though unlawfully, of a

* Gen. iii. 5. † *Ib.* 22. ‡ *Ib.* § *Ib.* 24.

"knowledge of good and evil," it was in the providence of God that his moral nature should now undergo a training. He was directed to "till the ground from whence he was taken."* This passage has a double signification, both literal and mystical. By the sweat of his brow was he to live, but by the labour of his soul was he to cultivate his whole mind, preparing it for the fruits of the knowledge he had illegitimately acquired, which should be his in the far future, that is, when it should be lawful for the sons of men to eat of that "Tree of Life" which S. John saw in the Apocalypse.†

How, then, was this training to be accomplished? Evidently by an influence acting upon his conscience, informing and directing it, and endowing it with the power of a pure free will. The law of bloody sacrifice was one appointed remedy. The mere observance of this divine law was, first, a recognition of Almighty God as Lord and Master; the acknowledgment of sins committed first by his primeval parents, and secondly by himself; and lastly, an implied resolution to obey God and forsake sin. Here we have laid bare the whole law of conscience, the duty of adoration and obedience, and the necessity of atonement. In that law of conscience is contained implicitly the whole decalogue —that is, duty to God and to our neighbour, the honour of parents, respect for human life, the purity of marriage, and the rights of property. These elementary laws were implanted in the soul

* Gen. iii. 23. † Rev. xxii. 1–7.

and mind of man from the very beginning, and he obtained power to distinguish between what was good and evil by the law of conscience. And this law of conscience was fully recognized by man as often as he offered sacrifice to God, which rite was, as I said above, a recognition of God's supremacy and the duty of obedience, and was also the means of his obtaining pardon for the past and strength for the future. The law of sacrifice, we observe, was delivered immediately after the Fall; and it is evident that at first it was intended to be exclusively a bloody one, the victim being "a firstling of the flock." This law, with modifications, became a universal one, and continued in all ages down to the advent of Christ; in process of time it became corrupted, and idolatry ensued, but the principle remained; and even in its lowest depths of corruption it was a witness of sin in man, and the expression of a desire in him for redemption, and reconciliation with the Divine power. God, however, did not choose to allow His worship to be universally corrupted; He selected one family, and one nation, wherein He set up a true altar and a true tabernacle and temple, wherein the law of sacrifice should be observed for ever, and means thus provided for the salvation of all, both the "stranger within the gate" and the faithful members of the chosen people.

But another method for training human morality was the appointment of teachers in every age of the world; some of these were specially commissioned by God, and others called, as it were, by His Providence. The "Sons of God" in

the ante-diluvian age were evidently those who formed the body of the Faithful in that age. Abel was a witness for the principle of obedience, and he sealed his testimony by his martyrdom, and his blood still speaks, witnessing for the truth. Seth, it may be presumed, followed the obedience of his brother Abel, and he became the ancestor of the holy Seed. Enoch must have been a most remarkable character, and, according to S. Jude, a great teacher in his day: so great he seems to have been in knowledge and sanctity, that in reward God gave to him the first Apocalypse,* and then "took him," for he was no more to be found anywhere upon the earth.† And it is believed that he will return during the time of Antichrist to be a witness to the nations, and then to suffer martyrdom. Noah was one "who found grace with God," and he was doubtless a great teacher during that apostate age when the "Sons of God" fraternized with all that was wicked and abominable.

After the Flood I need only remind you of Abraham, "the Friend of God," Moses, the great Lawgiver of the Israelites, the anointed royal saint, and the hierarchy of Priests and Prophets, all of whom gave testimony for God and on behalf of morality. During the captivity of Judah, many were the teachers in Israel, who spread the knowledge of God and the moral law in the Babylonian empire; notably the great prophet Daniel, and those three great Jews who withstood the

* S. Jude, 14, 15. † Gen. v. 24.

fire rather than adore the image of Nebuchadnezzar. Many, too, before the promulgation of the Gospel, had emigrated to other parts of the world; such as those dwelling "in Asia, Egypt, Crete, Arabia, and Rome," who carried with them in their exile the witness of God's truth. In the East, then, and in the West, even in the capital of the world, long before the advent of Christ, were there men who proclaimed the elementary laws of God. The Romans had heard of the Scriptures of the Old Testament, and that they had been read by them seems evident (they had been already translated into the Greek tongue), for some of their writers allude to them, and it is well known that some such great event as the first Advent had been expected at the very period it took place. The chosen people, then, became involuntarily the great missionaries of God, proclaiming everywhere, by their religion and by their example, the unity of the one God, the true law of sacrifice, and the great principles of sound morality.

But God had from the first other witnesses besides those of the house of Israel. For example, Job, who dwelt in Uz, in the Chaldees, taught the sublime virtue of patience under adversity. Then we read of Jethro, a "priest of Midian," "who came to the mountain of God," and "rejoiced for all the goodness which the Lord had done to Israel, whom He had delivered out of the hand of the Egyptians,"* and who gave Moses excellent counsel respecting the mode of resolving the innumerable

* Exod. iii. 1; xviii.

questions that were submitted to his judgment. So excellent was his counsel that it was accepted and grafted, with God's permission, in the divine law. Without doubt this was a man of God, and in his own country taught the unchangeable moral law of God.

§ 2.

Art and Science.

Art has ever been the handmaid of God for humanizing and civilizing the world, and I think it will generally be found that the higher the standard, the nearer will be the approach to a knowledge of God. By perfection I do not mean mere external beauty of form or symmetry, but that which is internal, so to speak, namely, the expression of the inspiration of the soul of man, the degree of which depends upon the amount of moral excellence with which he is endowed, and of divine knowledge which he has within or intuitively acquired. Man being formed both in the Image of God and in the image of Adam, *i.e.* partly of heaven and partly of earth, high art, in the true sense of the term, ought to express in fulness the grand perception of spiritual ideas and the glorious beauties contained in this earth. An absolutely perfect artist there cannot be, because none but a perfect man, free from all sin, could produce a faultless work. Art reached its height in all its branches during the fourteenth, fifteenth, and sixteenth centuries of our era; for artists in those days

were not a few of them deeply embued with religion, who seldom composed a great religious work without first approaching the altar of God, that they might derive thence—from Christ, the alone perfect man —that appreciation of the beautiful, to enable them to delineate the subject they were engaged upon as nearly as possible to perfection. For what do we mean by perfection in art? Not, as I have observed, mere external beauty,—for any one skilful with his brush or his chisel, and possessing the requisite knowledge of his art, can produce an *outwardly* faultless picture,—but the expression of the idea intended, which is the offspring of the soul. And it will be found that in that proportion of sanctity to which the soul of the artist has attained, in the same measure will be the fulness of the expression of the idea. In the ages of faith we have often seen remarkable examples of this, even in paintings grotesque and crude. And nothing shows this more than the rapid decay of art in all its branches after the so-called Reformation, when the faith was obscured; and, also, in our day, in the wretched eclecticisms of many works, beautiful in outward form and proportion, but destitute of every vestige of soul.

But to return. The history of pre-Christian art is interesting as expressing the character in various degrees of development in those ages, and as the earliest provision made by God for the civilization of the world, and for preparing the mind for the reception, in the latter days, of the immortal truths of the Gospel. It seems to me that art,

before the coming of Christ, may be classed in three distinct divisions, expressive of (1) intellectual materialism, (2) Spiritualism, and (3) decadence. We will briefly consider each separately.

1. There is no doubt that the ante-diluvians attained to a high degree of knowledge in the arts and sciences. We read that Cain built a city, calling it after his son, Enoch; that Jabal dwelt in tents and kept cattle; that Jubal invented the harp and organ; and that Tubalcain was an artisan in "brass and iron."* Here we have brought before us the commencement of art and science in their rudimentary form in four of their great branches,—Architecture, Agriculture, Music, and the manufacture of utensils and implements for public and domestic use. Nothing more is recorded concerning our subject for many hundred years, not until we arrive at the time of Noah. Now, according to the natural law of development inherent in man, we know that the manufacture of these arts, and the knowledge of science, must have undergone a gradual improvement; and from the rude hut, the still more rude instruments of music, and the execrable designs and workmanship of the first objects in brass and iron, considerable advance must have been made both in knowledge and skill.

That this was pre-eminently so is evident from the knowledge and practical skill Noah and his sons must have possessed when the former built the Ark, and the latter the Tower of Babel. Noah, indeed, received from God the general plan and dimensions of the Ark; but the preparation for building it, the

* Gen. iv. 17–22.

selection of the best materials, the mechanical contrivances for constructing the work, and the skill in putting the various parts together so as to form one whole, were the result of his own genius as a consummate artist and artisan. You may perhaps reply that God gave him the necessary talent for the purpose; it may have been so, though it is not recorded; but whence did his sons derive their knowledge and skill in the building of the Tower of Babel, which seems to have been such a masterpiece of work that God had to interfere for the purpose of putting an end to this wonderful, though unholy work. There is no doubt, then, that in the ante-diluvian period of the world men reached a high degree of material prosperity and civilization, of which the advanced state of art at that time was the witness and proof. Indeed, the moral state of men just before the Deluge indicates this; for it seems a law that when nations have arrived at the highest condition of prosperity, when art is approximating towards its culminating point of material perfection, the decadence begins, and men and women become addicted to vice and intemperance in its lowest form, resulting in apostasy.* This was evidently so just before the Deluge, as is recorded in the book of Genesis.

* This may seem a somewhat strange assertion, but is it not true? The primary use of art is to teach, not merely the intellect, but the heart; and it seems to have been ordained that nations and people in their infancy should, by its means, be taught to know God. Music is pre-eminently the divine art; it is the language of the soul; by it men praise God; by it men express their interior aspirations; and hence we are not surprised to find it mentioned in Holy Writ before painting and sculpture. As

Upon the dispersion, the knowledge of art acquired from the ante-diluvian times of course accompanied the sons of Noah and their descendants, but especially in the line of Ham, whose children peopled Egypt and the Assyrian empire.

Let us first turn to Egypt, for that country is, without doubt, the first of the series of mighty empires which have governed in turn the destinies of the world. The first thing that strikes us upon entering that ancient land are those wondrous Pyramids, which undoubtedly strike the imagination with awe. Who were the men who built those tremendous monuments of old, and when were they erected? It is said that some of them were existing within a few hundred years after the Deluge, and some were standing when Abraham visited Egypt. In that arid desert land these marvellous proofs of early human art stand in all their majestic grandeur; the solemn witnesses of some four thousand years of history, which the patriarchs of old, the Infant Jesus, and His Blessed Mother, and the holy Joseph have witnessed, even

long then as art expresses the feelings of the soul towards God, it fulfils its function; but when men are satisfied with mere beauty of outward form, whether it be in painting or sculpture, of men and women, and objects in nature, the decadence has commenced, and the result follows with certainty—debasement of character, loss of purity, failure in faith, and finally apostasy. It is a remarkable fact that pagan Greece and Rome, and in modern times Protestant countries, and paganized artists abroad, are famous for their powers on canvas and stone or marble; but where is the true spirit of high art? High art is the expression of the ideal, that is, God and the Incarnate Son, the crown of perfection.

the very same that some of us have seen and wondered at.

Consider the immense advance that had been made by the early primitive races of man in art and science. Consider the largeness of mind that conceived so stupendous an idea as to plan and erect such gigantic buildings, as also the deep knowledge of mechanical science, accompanied with marvellous skill, that must have possessed those early artists and artisans.

The ancient temples, too, of Egypt were wonderful productions of man's ingenuity. Those massive columns which form the nave and aisles of those ancient fanes, the colossal statues of heroes that guarded the outward edifice, with the crouching sphinx at their feet, indicate a breadth of mind and power of intelligence hardly excelled even in the middle ages. Now, what lesson did these two classes of buildings in Egypt, together with the sculpture contained therein, teach the world in the post-diluvian age? I would reply, Majesty and the idea of Eternity. Art which expresses ideas large and broad, which impresses the mind with awe and fills the imagination with wonder, fairly represents the notion of majesty—majesty of man. And then, again, the gigantic fabrics of the Pyramids, the massive columns of the temples, and the colossal forms of gods and deified heroes, indicate precisely the idea of eternity; and this seems confirmed by the fact that the sovereigns and princes were embalmed, that their bodies might remain incorrupt for ever.

But we must not forget that while the ancient

Egyptians were noted for the grandeur and magnificence of their art, they had at the same time a poetical side to their character. Those graceful obelisks—the sculptured tabulæ of the Egyptians—which point towards heaven, indicated a delicacy of sentiment and a refinement of mind very striking, and show that, notwithstanding the massiveness of those early characters, they were not utterly deficient in the knowledge of the beautiful and in the appreciation of poetical feeling.

Art, then, in Egypt, material though it was, inculcated in the world the idea of majesty and eternity,—the majesty of the human race and the eternity of its existence, and it also taught that the destiny of man was heaven.

2. High art, as far as this was possible before the dawn of Christianity, shone in splendour in the famous land of Græcia. For the first time the soul made itself felt in art. Hitherto art had been for the most part material in conception and execution, now a higher inspiration begins to dawn upon the minds of men. The heavy architecture of the Egyptians now gives place to a higher order. The massive pillars that supported the ponderous entablatures of the Temple of Thebes yield to the less bulky columns of the Doric order, which marks the advancing step. Then in turn followed the Ionic form, which was a refinement on the Doric; and then we have that most beautiful of all classic styles, never surpassed in beauty of symmetry—the Corinthian order, which was a marvel of consummate art and of wonderful skill in execution. These three great styles of architecture are highly

expressive of the two great faculties of the mind of man,—the Imagination and the Reason.

How admirably does the stately Corinthian column, exquisitely proportioned in height and circumference, with its graceful capital formed after the beautiful acanthus, surmounted with its delicate and refined pedimentum ascending towards heaven, represent the poetical side of the human mind, founded upon stern reason, well symbolized by the massive and yet splendid style of the great Doric order. And again, if we look upon that pure and refined Ionic order, its graceful columns, and capital composed of the horns of a ram—the victim of sacrifice—do we not discern the acknowledgment of the religious principle, by which alone the imagination and the reason are sanctified and preserved within the lines of solid truth? You may think these observations very fanciful, but if it were possible for you to study the minds of those great architects who conceived and planned those glorious temples of antiquity, you would, I think, perceive that much that I have said is true to the letter.

We must not forget other great works of Grecian art, even the sculpture which adorned the temples and halls of ancient Greece. What wonderful masterpieces have the Greek artists produced which have never yet been surpassed. As models of perfect beauty of form and symmetry, they are still unrivalled. Perhaps the most striking feature in Greek sculpture is its refinement and purity; there is nothing low or sensual in it, excelling in this respect even the works of modern pious artists. Grecian art represents to the mind purity and

innocence; and notwithstanding that its choicest models are undraped, there is nothing in them to raise the blush of shame.

The influence of Grecian art, in its highest development, could not fail to be of immense service to the human race, and had a large place in God's Providence for preparing the world for the reception of Christianity. Its effect was to rub off the rough edge of barbarism, and to file away the grosser ideas of the mere human animal. It elevated men Godward, notwithstanding that they knew not the true God, and raised men from low materialism to contemplate things beyond this earthly sphere.

No heathen nation ever penetrated so far into the mysteries of the unseen world as the Greeks, and no people were so great as they in contemplative power. Indeed, if I am not mistaken, this was a unique privilege granted to the Greeks, the result mainly of the deep study of high art; and further, no people have excelled them in literature, which, if not the actual result, at least was greatly aided by the force of that deep meditative faculty, which Art, in its highest sense, has the power to create and foster.

Those who have studied the works of the ancient Greeks cannot but be amazed at the grandeur of their literature. How heart-stirring and soul-inspiring are those matchless lines of the Iliad! What dramatic power is exhibited by some of the best tragedians, such as Æschylus, Euripides, &c.! How graphically is the story of the Peloponnesian war told by the great Thucydides, and how rich is

the glowing language of Herodotus when narrating the events that have distinguished his race! And how struck with astonishment are those who have studied the works of that great elocutionist, the immortal Demosthenes, whose elegance of diction, depth of thought, and marvellous eloquence, have scarcely ever been rivalled!* But this is not all. The Greek works of deep philosophy are still masters of the field of original thought. In the Christian era there have been but two or three who have approached them in philosophical power; these are Origen, S. Augustine, and S. Thomas Aquinas, and these, it must be remembered, had this immense advantage, that they knew the true God, and Jesus Christ, His only Son; they possessed the Light, whereas their predecessors were in the midst of the dense darkness of gross paganism. And yet they almost found out the Truth. Socrates, and his disciple Plato, perhaps, advanced farther in the discovery of the existence of the True God than any other in the school of philosophy. When S. Paul came to Athens, he found there an altar "to the unknown God."† The Greeks had discerned that the gods they worshipped were not of the highest order; they felt that there was One who was Supreme; the very power of their mind seemed to force this view upon them, and so they erected their altar as the symbol of that they knew not.

* I do not speak of these great authors from any *special* knowledge of their writings. It is many years ago since I read any classical Greek or Latin work. I do but state what every educated man knows to be true.

† Acts xvii. 23.

The philosophy of the Greeks, so remarkable for its profundity of thought, has, so far as it is true, been deemed worthy by the Holy Ghost to become, as it were, the outward vestment of Catholic theology. When our Lord delivered to the Apostles the deposit of Faith, it became necessary, from time to time, to clothe it in such words as would so fix the truth in the minds of the Faithful, that they should not only understand it, but that it should be impossible for them to pervert it.

It was given to Aristotle to distinguish substance from accidents. He taught that every substance possesses a something which he denominated as Essence. That which we see, taste, and smell are the accidents, the essence ever remaining intact and invisible. When our Lord instituted the Blessed Sacrament, He Himself changed the Bread and Wine into His very Body and Blood; that is, the substance or essence of Bread and Wine was so converted that it no longer existed, though the accidents, viz. that which we see, taste, and smell, remained as they were before. Aristotle has the unspeakable honour of formulating those principles which the Holy Ghost adopted for expressing the great dogma of Transubstantiation. This circumstance alone shows how deep, how profound, and in many respects how true was Greek philosophy.

What a marvellous people the Greeks must have been, and what a large place they fill in the Providence of God for civilizing and teaching the world —by the glory of their art, by the culture of their mind, by the grandeur of their ideas, and by the splendour of their immortal literature.

3. Upon the fall of the Greeks and their subjugation by the Romans, art begins to decay. Pagan Rome of itself knew nothing of true art.

All Roman art was simply eclectic; she copied the art of the illustrious people she conquered. Her temples and buildings were erected from Grecian models, and Greeks were chiefly employed in their erection. The only original productions of Rome were the Tuscan and Composite orders: that is, in the case of the latter, the mixture of the Ionic and Corinthian, an innovation which was no improvement in art, but debasement and decay. The grand Coloseum, the most renowned edifice in the Roman world, glorious in its immensity, and still more glorious as the monument of the martyrs of the ten persecutions, is nevertheless a splendid representation of Greek debased art. How contrary to the genius of true art to erect columns upon columns, the base of the one resting upon the entablature of the one below it.

The Romans, however, discovered the arch, and that, I think, is the only original invention that they ever made; but it was nevertheless to be fruitful in vast developments in the Christian dispensation. Though art, in its highest ideal, had fallen before Christ had come into the world, it had done its work, and had greatly aided in so cultivating the intellect of man, in so humanizing and civilizing him, and so refining his mind, that he became capable of conceiving grand ideas and elaborating them, and even furnishing the formulæ for clothing the inspired doctrines of Christianity with words to express to the soul, as far as possible, the mysteries of divine

Truth. Without the aid of the Greeks, humanly speaking, the Church would never have been able to place before her children the magnificent symbol of S. Athanasius, or the dogmatic decrees of the Councils of Nicæa and of Trent. The dogma of Consubstantiality by the former, and that of Transubstantiation by the latter, were formulated by those who well knew the grand philosophy of the Greeks, whom God had raised up for service, not only in their generation, but in that of His Church, under the infallible guidance of the Holy Ghost, speaking through His mouthpiece, the Sovereign Pontiff.

§ 3.

Political Economy.

Another method for preparing man's mind for the first Advent, and its outcome, was government and the administration of law. No doubt, until God was pleased to reveal His will, government and law could only be founded and enforced according to human maxims, the necessities of society, and the dictates of conscience. God was pleased to reveal His will to the chosen people; but inasmuch as it was written in a language not understood by the outer world, it was to them virtually a sealed book, and many centuries elapsed before the Pentateuch was translated into Greek. Legislation and government, then, had to depend upon the dictates of reason and conscience, informed by traditionary testimony, for the enactment and enforcement of good laws and for effective government.

The effect of all law is to discipline the mind, to induce well-disposed persons to good behaviour, to force those inclined to evil to obedience, and to punish the wicked with the sword of justice.

This principle is fully laid down by the Apostles: "The powers that be," that is, then, the heathen power, "are ordained of God." "Let every soul be subject" to them. S. Peter confirms this when he says: "Submit yourselves to every ordinance of man for the Lord's sake: whether it be to the king, as supreme, or unto governors, as to them that are sent by him for the punishment of evil-doers, and for the praise of them that do well"; and S. Paul declares that the Ruler "is the Minister of God," who "beareth not the sword in vain," to "execute wrath upon him that doeth evil."* Rulers, then, of all times, pagan though they were, were the ministers of justice, "ordained of God," for the punishment of evil and the reward of the good. Hence law was the "Schoolmaster" for the government of peoples, and for training them in the discipline of righteousness, first to God (or, to him whom they supposed was their god), and secondly, to society, which could not exist a moment without law.

A knowledge of the moral law of God as ingrained on the conscience would not have sufficed without a method of enforcing its observance; and the cultivation of the arts and sciences would have effeminated the human mind, if the law of conscience enforced by an executive authority had not

* Rom. xiii. 1, 4; 1 Pet. ii. 13, 14.

been prescribed. These three accessories, which God had provided, were necessary for the end He had in view; the first, to inform by the voice of conscience; the second, to refine by the contemplation of the beautiful; and the third, to drill the mind and the body, that the whole man might be masculine and strong; of course, in a right point of view.

Now it has pleased God, in the midst of universal corruption, to raise up celebrated legislators in the three great kingdoms that were to rule mankind—Egypt, Greece, and Rome. In Egypt, the king was the legislator as well as ruler, and the law was administered in his name by thirty judges, who judged for the whole kingdom. The most excellent parts in the laws of Egypt were the inhibition (1) of murder, the punishment of which was death; (2) of perjury, which was also capital; (3) false accusations; (4) of any neglect to save life, and in default, death; (5) of polygamy to the priests, a slight recognition of the original divine law in this respect, though it was allowed to others; and lastly, of adultery. Then, with respect to civil law, provisions were made (1) that all children of women, whether free or slaves, were free and legitimate; (2) that all men were bound to serve their country; (3) that none should borrow money, except on certain conditions; and (4) that great respect should be paid to old age. In these laws, without doubt, there was much good, and many points were evidently borrowed from the moral law of God.*

* Tytler's "Universal History," Book I. chap. iv.

So excellent were the laws of the Egyptians that the Greeks, their successors in the family of nations, came to Egypt to study them. There is no doubt that the Egyptians were one of the most celebrated people for wisdom and knowledge. "This kingdom," writes Rollin, "bestowed its noblest labours and fine arts on the improving mankind; and Greece was so sensible of this, that its most illustrious men, as Homer, Pythagoras, Plato, even its great legislators, Lycurgus and Solon, with many more whom it is needless to mention, travelled into Egypt to complete their studies, and drew from that fountain whatever was most rare and valuable in every kind of learning. God Himself has given this kingdom a glorious testimony. When praising Moses, He says of him that he 'was learned in all the wisdom of the Egyptians.'" *

The laws of Crete were somewhat similar in spirit to those of Egypt. Minos was the first legislator; the end he proposed in the establishment of law was to "render his subjects happy by making them virtuous." This is the grand principle of the moral law, for real happiness consists of true virtue, that is, obedience to the law of God and man. He forbade "idleness," "voluptuousness," "luxury and vicious pleasures," which he held, and rightly held, were the "fruitful sources of all vice." Minos directed that all children should be educated in "troops and bands," that is, as we now say, in classes. He decreed their life should be "hard

* Rollin's "Ancient Hist.," vol. i. p. 24. Eng. Tr. Edin. 1813. See Acts vii. 22.

and sober," should be "satisfied with little," endure "heat and cold," practise arms, and suffer "blows with courage." Doubtless the object of these laws was to form a nation of soldiers for "the sake of peace," as Minos ordained.

Lycurgus formed his code mainly upon that of Crete. Notwithstanding the barbarity of the age, Lycurgus was a model of severe integrity. He was a king for a few days, but on hearing that the wife of his elder brother was with child, he resolved to govern the kingdom as his guardian. The wretched woman offered to destroy her offspring if he would marry her, but Lycurgus was struck with horror at the outrageous proposal. He waited till the child was born, and then proclaimed him king, and took pains to bring him up in a proper manner. It is refreshing, in the obscurity of the truly speaking "dark ages," to find one endowed with so high a degree of severe integrity as this renowned personage—a model and example in many respects even to Christian monarchs and statesmen.

Lycurgus, before he prepared his famous code, visited the island of Crete, whose hard and austere laws were very famous; he then visited Asia, and finally Egypt, which was then the seat of science, wisdom, and good counsels. Upon the information he collected from all these sources he drew up his system of law and government. With respect to the State he instituted a Senate, consisting of twenty-eight senators, exclusive of the two kings, who presided over it, the object being to limit the natural despotism of the kings, and

to check the tendencies of the people to too much power. It is convenient to observe here that, with a view of curbing the power of the Senate, an institution was made, about a hundred and thirty years after the death of Lycurgus, of a conclave, called the Ephori, five in number, who were elected by the people, and remained in office for one year.*

The government of Sparta was in theory a limited one, consisting of the sovereign authority checked by the wisdom of senators and by the power of the people. Many useful laws were made for the division of land and the regulation of goods and chattels. As regards morality, the laws were severe, even to cruelty. Lycurgus restrained the tendency to luxury and softness, and the love of riches, by suppressing all "the magnificence and extravagance of expensive tables; by requiring all the citizens to eat together of the same common victuals what the law prescribed; and by expressly forbidding all private eating at their own houses." It must have been a strange sight to see rich and poor, together with children of all ages, sitting together in companies of fifteen persons each, every one receiving a certain prescribed measure of flour, wine, cheese, figs, and a small sum of money to cook the same. "Every one, without exception of persons," from the king to his lowest subject, "was obliged to be at this common meal; and a long time after the making of these regulations [some 600 years after], King Agis, on his return

* Tytler's "Univer. Hist.," Book I. chap. ix.

from a glorious expedition, having taken the liberty to dispense with that law, in order to eat with the queen his wife, was reprimanded and punished."

Children, Lycurgus considered, belonged to the State more than to the parents. When a child was born, a commission was appointed to visit and inspect the child; if he should happen to be strong and healthy, he was endowed with a small patrimony and trained to a hard regimen of discipline. This education of children was only an apprenticeship to obedience, obedience to their master and superiors. The office of the parent was ignored; he was regarded as little better than a sort of civil deputy of the State for the production and rearing its children: so stern was this idea, that the State used to put to death all deformed and sickly children as unfit to be citizens. Lycurgus further prescribed laws to inspire the love of virtue and hatred of vice, and in war, to be merciful to the conquered, never to pursue them further than was necessary to make them certain of victory.

Though Lycurgus recognized the institution of religion when he sought the oracle of Apollo, and offered sacrifice, yet the object he had in view was not so much the service of the gods as to form a moral and hardy race fit for war. The science of war was the passion of the Greeks, as it was afterwards with the Romans, and consequently every means were applied to form a warlike and invincible race. The very mothers of children joined heartily in the Spartan principles of legislation, and they used to say to their sons, on "going to make a campaign, that they should return either with or

upon their shields," and when any were killed, they would each say, "I brought him into the world for no other end."

I do not intend to enter into detail into the laws of Solon, the great Athenian legislator; suffice it to say that they were founded on a much more benevolent and religious system than the Lycurgan code. The offices of the State he designed to be filled by persons of wealth; the famous Areopagus he did not institute, but he improved it and augmented its authority, leaving to its superintendence the affairs of the country and the execution of the laws. He instituted a second council, composed of 400 men, directing that all causes and affairs should be submitted to it before being proposed to the general assembly of the people.

§ 4.

Rome.

Rome was the emporium of all that was good and great in the old world's civilization. In her was found the barbaric splendour of Asiatic emperors, the rude glory of the early Egyptians, and the graceful accomplishments of the Greeks, in art, polite literature, and profound philosophy. From Greece she derived much of her form of government, and her magnificent jurisprudence, based originally on the Twelve Tables, and codified and enlarged by the Emperor Justinian (which became the foundation of the laws of many European nations, inclusive of Scotland), received

its inspiration from the celebrated legislations of the most eminent of the Greek sages.

Without doubt, Rome was the embodiment of the ancient civilization, and she was the apex of the fabric of the old political system. Holy Scripture represents this grand old empire under the emblem of a human figure,* and although it describes Rome as the "Feet" of the Colossus, the meaning is the same, namely, that the whole world's polity was in her, supported by her, and spread by her means all over the then known world. Now what are the great points of character of the Roman dominion in her best days, that is, before corruption began to feed upon her heart? Stern morality, as understood before the institution of Christianity, inflexible justice, and discipline, as enforced by military law. By morality, as then understood, is meant respect for religion, though a false one, obedience to authority, and the recognition of rights. It may seem strange to describe Pagan worship as a religion, but we have to deal with a period when the knowledge of the true God was unknown, or at most, partially known, for revelation had been made to none but the favoured people. The worship of Jupiter and of Juno, expressed the desire of the ancient Romans to recognize, under a corrupt form, the Supreme Lord and the Chief Lady, who, in their estimation, were the joint rulers of the universe.

Other deities they adored, as Mars, the god of war, Ceres, the goddess of corn, &c., to obtain from

* Dan. ii.

them the needful assistance for all requirements of man. The sentiment of religion was respected; the worship, though false, was derived by long tradition from the earliest ages of the world, and expressed the great principle of the adoration of God and the intervention of spirits; sentiments which were coeval with the primeval ages.

In process of time this false worship became still more corrupt as the Roman empire extended, and then she became the Pantheon of all nations, worshipping not only the chief of the gods, but every foul spirit representative of the vilest passions of our nature.

Obedience to authority was sternly exacted from all. With a view to sound government, the Romans provided admirable machinery for enforcing "respect for the laws." During the Republic, the most eminent administrators were the Consuls, who were the supreme governors of Rome and the provinces; they had authority to assemble the Senate and the tribunes of the people, to cause laws to be passed, and to execute their decrees. They received reports from the chiefs of the provinces, letters from foreign States, and gave audience to the ambassadors. Next to them were the Prætors, who administered justice; then Censors, for enumerating the population and estimating the value of property, both public and private. They had, too, a further duty, to inspect the morals of the citizens.

And in addition to these there were other magistrates who were judges, of whom there seems to have been four grades: one, the judge of fact and law; another in legal causes, answering to what

we understand by equity; a third, for the recovery of lost property; and lastly, the Centumviri, the elect of the thirty-five tribes, whose chief business was to adjudicate concerning testament and inheritance.

With regard to religious matters in Rome, there was a hierarchy of priests, subject to a college composed of dignitaries, called Pontifices, presided over by a Pontifex Maximus, an office which was subsequently assumed by the Emperors, when their priestly jurisdiction embraced the whole world. In the provinces the same care was taken for founding good government, by the appointment in each of a Prætor, called afterwards a Proconsul, who governed it, and administered justice, with the assistance of a certain number of Lieutenants.

Such was the admirable system of government as practised in the best days of the Roman Republic.

The morality of a nation is generally gauged by its marriage law. If a State respects the marriage bond, it may be assumed that the moral tone is not in a low condition. Of course, this must not be measured by the Christian standard. Morality of pre-Christian centuries must be ascertained according to the tradition of mankind as confessedly handed down from primeval times, and if the sentiment of morality is admitted in its legal code, it may be assumed that the law of God has in some degree at least been respected. It seems paradoxical to assert that the Mosaic law of marriage was by no means high; certainly not if compared to the Christian standard. Indeed, this opens a large

question, viz. what is morality? Doubtless morality in the abstract is that of obedience to God's law, as either engraved in the conscience or prescribed by the law of God, written or unwritten. The standard, then, must be that which has been fixed by God.

In the beginning of the world, men were of necessity forced to marry their sisters in blood, because there were no others to marry. Was this, then, an immoral or incestuous act? By no means; and for this reason, because God had then imposed no law of limitation. In judging, therefore, Roman morality in the best days of the Republic, we must not take a higher standard than that of Moses; indeed, I should say a lower one would be more just and correct. Taking these considerations into account, I think it may be asserted, without fear of contradiction, that the Roman law of morality, before corruption set in, was sound.

The Romans recognized three sorts of marriages: first, when a woman, with consent of her parents, contracted to live with a man a whole year, not being absent from home longer than three days; secondly, when a couple were married by the Pontifex Maximus or by the Flamen Dialis, in the presence of ten witnesses; and thirdly, by a mode of mutual purchase. In either form the man and woman were bound together as man and wife. Other alliances were allowed, but they were not legal, nor were the children legitimate. Divorces were permitted for violation of conjugal faith, for murder of offspring, and, indeed, for any infringement of the matrimonial contract. Such was the general law of

marriage among Roman citizens. It is remarkable that second marriages of women were not regarded as honourable, and those who had been faithful to the memory of their first husbands were held in high esteem. It would seem, upon the whole, Roman wives were faithful. It is asserted that, although the laws allowed husbands the liberty of divorce, there was no instance of its being exercised for about 520 years. Undoubtedly this fact witnesses for Rome in her best days a high moral tone as regards her free women.

A people so great as the Roman people in the zenith of their glory could not be otherwise than fit for a large measure of political liberty. At first the State was monarchical, governed by despotic kings, who abused their power and were dethroned. They were succeeded by the Consulate, consisting of two consuls, elected by the Senate, composed at first of 100 members, and elected by the Patricians. In addition there was the Comitia, which was an assembly of the whole Roman people for recording their vote on any question. In the Comitia, everything that concerned the people was transacted; magistrates were chosen, laws passed, and declarations of war or of peace made. Concerning private rights, every one who had his abode in Rome or Roman territory became a Roman citizen. Roman citizens possessed the right of liberty, the right of marriage, the right of holding legal property and of disposing of it by will. I have said enough to show that there were elements in the Roman polity fitted to form a universal people gifted with noble virtues, a high tone of morality (according to pre-

Christian ideas), and endowed with a civilization scarcely surpassed even in these days of boasted pre-eminence.

Such was the organization and constitution of the great Roman Republic, which had been formed into a universal empire by the wonderful prowess and skill of its armies, and consolidated by means of that magnificent political system Rome had everywhere established, and had held together for a long period by her splendid and unrivalled jurisprudence. All that was great in learning, in art, and in science, which had been inaugurated and developed in preceding ages, found a home in her; and all that was good in itself and worth preserving was engrafted in her system; the very peoples themselves, their manners and customs, and their various forms of worship, were moulded together and consolidated into one great massive whole, so that the Republic became a unity, the like of which had never been seen before, with one people, composed of divers races, and, in the midst of variation, having one principle of government, of law, and religion. It was a glorious example of a universal empire established and maintained on the principle of a diversity in unity, and of a unity in diversity.

The training of the universal race of man was as complete as possible, without Christianity, being effected by military discipline, by constitutional principles as far as they went, by the maintenance of order and regularity in the commonwealth, and by the equitable administration of justice that for a long time prevailed in the courts of law. The world could not have received a better preparation,

in the absence of any Revelation for the future reception of the Gospel, than that provided by the Roman dominion in its best days.

It is true that corruption of manners set in almost immediately after the conquest of Asia Minor, from which luxury and effeminacy were imported into the palaces and mansions of consuls and people; but yet the great work of discipline and training of mind and body had been accomplished, and it needed only the mission of the Messiah and His Apostles, to raise the human race to the high position it had been from all eternity predestined.

§ 5.

The Asiatic Powers.

It would be improper to omit all notice of the great Asiatic nations which flourished before the Greeks and Romans rose to the summit of their greatness and power. These consisted principally of Assyria, India, China, Babylon, and Medo-Persia, of which the first and two last were, politically, the most important. Each of these nations rose to considerable eminence and civilization, as is evident from the extant remains of their art, and from the circumstance that science and learning were cultivated, especially in Chaldæa, wherein was situated the college of the Magi, which continued till, at least, the birth of our Saviour.

These empires—especially that of Babylon—had the advantage of having among them for many years the captive Jews, who spread among them

the knowledge of the true God; and for some time were even governed by such men as Daniel. Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego,* who became the chief ministers of Babylon, Daniel holding the office of viceroy of "the King of kings."

But notwithstanding all these advantages, it does not appear that these great and powerful empires had any influence in forming the character of mankind, and fitting them for the reception of the Gospel in future ages. It seems a law, that all civilization and knowledge should travel westward; these began, as far as we know, in Egypt, the most renowned kingdom of the earliest age after the Deluge, and passed on to the Greeks, from them to Rome, in these latter ages to America, and perhaps in the future may reach the far west, that is, from our geographical position, the utmost bounds of the East.

Of all the Oriental kingdoms, the most spiritual and well-ordered people were the Persians. Their kingdom was very early divided into provinces, each governed by a satrap or prince, who was appointed directly by the Sovereign. Order was rigidly enforced; murder, adultery, theft, violence, and injustice were held to be crimes offensive to God and destructive of the best interests of society. Agriculture was greatly encouraged, as pleasing to the divinity. The Persians were particular in the education of their children. Every child at five years of age was placed under the care of the Magi, and trained to "virtue and good morals," "to have

* Dan. iii. 12; vi. 2.

a sacred regard to truth," to "venerate parents," to respect magistrates, and to obey the laws of the State. They were also trained in every manly exercise.

Under Cyrus and his successors this empire rose to great power, conquering and absorbing within itself the circumjacent nations, the Babylo-Assyrian empire, and Egypt. As I have observed, these Oriental nations had no lasting influence in the formation of the character of the human family, and this may have arisen from a radical defect in the education of the people. In the Western nations, the main principle that underlaid the education of children and youth was one which promoted self-restraint, self-sacrifice, and patient endurance of suffering. Such a training as this could not fail to result in the formation of a race strong in character, firm of purpose, and persevering in the accomplishment of designs prearranged. Hence the rise of the great Western powers of antiquity; and hence, too, that mental solidity which resulted in the wonderful advance in literature and science. Now, in the Oriental nations, the discipline of the mind, the restraint of the natural passions, and the repression of all luxury, formed no part of the regimen prescribed for the training of youth. On the contrary, self-indulgence and luxury were greatly encouraged, if not actually enforced.

This circumstance alone would account for that feebleness of character which generally distinguished the Oriental nations, and the consequent inability to exercise any lasting influence on the world at large.

Then, again, the pantheism, which was the fundamental principle of various religions in the East, had a very degrading effect, and would of itself present an obstacle to the healthy development of mind and spirit. It is certainly a remarkable fact that Christianity made far greater strides in the West than in the East, and this because there were elements favouring its progress in the former which were wanting in the latter. In fact, those great nations,—Assyria, Babylon, and Medo-Persia,—while they certainly formed links in the history of the five great empires that ruled the world before Rome had reached the zenith of her glory, were little better than colossal brute forces, possessing no aspirations above things of sense. In the West there was a spirit within, the tendency of which, notwithstanding revolting corruptions, was upward, which showed itself in the study of art and science and philosophy; but in the East it took an opposite turn, enslaving the mind, and addicting it to the vilest superstitions.

CHAPTER III.

THE LAW.

We have seen how God was preparing the world for the reception at the proper time of His Gospel; how, by means of certain great nations, which He raised up for the purpose, mankind was disciplined by the action of laws of great severity; how the minds of men were cultured by a literature unsurpassed even at this day for elegance of expression and fecundity of thought, and how manners were refined and purified by high art, the works of which are still the marvel of the civilized world. But nevertheless it pleased God to maintain upon earth a system of divine law which should, in the ages to come, be the witness of truth and justice. To preserve this law, He, from the very commencement of the history of the world, appointed authorized witnesses and exponents.

In the first ages we read of persons called the "Sons of God." These probably formed the body of the Faithful in those days till they apostatized; they were the witnesses of God and the keepers of the Tradition of the divine will. Of these, three at least were saints: first, Abel, the proto-martyr and virgin; Enoch, whom God assumed in the body; and Noah, the preacher of righteousness, in whom was centred all that was known of the divine will.

During this period we have indications of what was prohibited and what permitted respecting the moral law. Clearly murder was forbidden, as is more than implied by the curse that fell upon Cain for the slaughter of his brother Abel, and by the lamentation of Lamech, who, in his anguish, exclaimed: "If Cain be avenged sevenfold, truly Lamech seventy and sevenfold."*

Unchastity was evidently at that early age prohibited. Of course, we must not define this word by the law of Christian ethics: before the Incarnation men were allowed more than one wife, and other wives too, lower in grade in the social circle. Lamech had more than one wife;† Abraham had only one wife at a time, but with her another inferior one.‡ Jacob had two wives, and others lower in degree.§ David had many "concubines and wives."‖ These inferior wives must not be confounded with illicit connections of the present day. They were really wives, so far as this, that they were bound to their husbands, and their children were legitimate. In fact, in those days, the first object of all women was to have children, with the hope of one of them being privileged to be the mother of the Messiah. When Eve bore Cain, she exclaimed, in the gladness of her heart, "I have gotten a man from the Lord,"¶ meaning, without doubt, the Seed which had been promised by God in the garden of Eden. But what was evidently forbidden was the abomination we

* Gen. iv. 24. † *Ib.* 19. ‡ *Ib.* xvi. 3.
§ *Ib.* xxix. 23, 28; xxx. 4, 9. ‖ 2 Sam. v. 13.
¶ Gen. iv. 1.

now call socialism. It was this crime that hurried on the judgment of the Flood, which destroyed all, save the faithful eight souls.

The primary law of worship seems to have been established at the very beginning, consisting of the sacrifice of a victim taken from the "firstling of the flock."* Cain refused to obey the divine command, and offered instead the fruits of the earth;† that is, of that which had been polluted by man's sin and cursed by God.‡ After the Deluge, the tradition of truth was handed down by the sons of Noah and carried into the nations west and north of Babel—into Egypt and Assyria. Doubtless all that was good in the laws of these countries was derived from the primeval laws of God; but soon corruption set in, the name of the true God faded from the memory of men, and divine worship was transformed into the adoration of low material objects.

It is certainly wonderful that Egypt, so enlightened, so full of high ideas, so learned in the science of the stars, so advanced in the arts and sciences, should have stooped so low as to fall down and adore a cat! But there is a moral in this which may be useful to us even of this generation. It matters not how exalted may be our ideas; how high our notions of things in general; how deep may be our researches into the very arcana of nature; or how profound may be our erudition; if we believe not in God, if we deny the inspiration of holy Scripture, or the authority of the one sole

* Gen. iv. 4. † *Ib.* 3. ‡ *Ib.* iii. 17.

Church of Christ, we shall all of us be liable to stoop to the worship of cats and reptiles, even to the recognition of that poor creature the ape, our common ancestor in the flesh, as some foolish authors say! Egypt, prolific indeed in type, is a type of a great people of high aspirations, sinking to so low a condition of soul as to offer its homage, not to the nobler representatives of nature, but to that of the lower orders of animal existence.

The tradition of God's will being lost, Almighty God determined to select a particular personage, who should become the ancestor of a family and of nations, one of which He designed to be the emporium of the divine law. From this point follow two great periods, viz. that which extended to the Exodus, and that which was subsequent. Let us consider the law as in operation in both these periods.

1. The moral law, as it stood in the time of Abraham and his children and grandchildren, is summed up, first in the duty of worshipping God by sacrifice, and the sanctity of marriage, which was clearly asserted when God interposed to prevent Pharaoh and Abimelech from taking to wife the spouses respectively of Abraham and Isaac,* who, from fear of death, had yielded them up to the demand of these princes.

The degree of consanguinity and affinity within which a man might marry seems to have been almost unlimited; but if we may judge from what

* Gen. xii. 10–20; xxvi. 6–11.

fell from Abraham in his conversation with Abimelech, it was unlawful for a man to marry a half-sister on the *mother's* side;* and hence it would seem that, though there existed on this point no written law, intermarriages between brother and sister had been forbidden as soon as it was possible to do so.†

* Gen. xx. 12.

† This is only an inference drawn from the language of Abraham: Sarah "is the daughter of my father, but not the daughter of my mother; and she became my wife." Some say that she was Abraham's niece, but the text seems decisive in favour of her being his half-sister. At any rate, from the Creation to the Exodus there does not seem to have been any limitation of the laws of affinity and consanguinity. There was the natural law, originally delivered to Adam, which doubtless prohibited marriage between parents and their children. Adam had no other wife than Eve, for all other women were his daughters, or grand-daughters, or great grand-daughters, none of whom could he have married. Two breaches of this natural law are recorded; first, in the case of Reuben, sinning with one of his father's wives (not being his mother), for which offence he forfeited his birthright (see Gen. xlix. 3, 4); the other, that of Tamar, who by disguising herself deceived Judah, her father-in-law, a crime committed out of revenge for his not having given her to wife to Shelah, "to raise up seed" to his brother, her first husband. By this wicked act, she was not only abandoned by Judah, for "he knew her no more," but she rendered it impossible for him to permit his son to marry her, according to the law, which at that time was evidently in force (*Ib.* xxxviii.). From these two examples, it is clear that the natural law prohibited all intercourse between parents and their children. The case of Lot and his two daughters is difficult to explain, nor shall I attempt it, for God recognized the rights of the Moabites and the Ammonites, because they were the descendants of Lot, and this without a word of censure (see *Ib.* xix. 31–38; and Deut. ii. 9).

With regard to the intermarriage between brother and sister, at least son and daughter of the same father, there does not seem

Another law is indicated, namely, the duty of children towards their parents, as shown by the conduct of Isaac, who, at his father's command, prepared himself for sacrifice;* and by the sons of Jacob, who, for their undutiful behaviour to their father, had to humble themselves to their victim when viceroy of Egypt.†

The laws respecting divine worship remained the same. The office of priest was held as a rule by the head of a family or tribe; but this was not an invariable rule, for Abel sacrificed in his father's time, and Jacob before he became head of the tribe.‡

The first-born no doubt possessed privileges which younger sons had not, and it is probable that they shared the office of priest with their father. The chief of the tribe was a sovereign, having power to govern his people and enforce the law. Abraham, at the command of God, directed all his tribe to circumcise themselves,§ and he executed summary punishment on the five kings who had carried away Lot.‖

We come now to the most interesting part of our subject.

2. After a chasm of some 400 years in the history of the Israelites, we find them a most numerous

to have been any prohibition till the promulgation of the divine law, and that law only concerned the children of Israel. Those who desire to examine this question more particularly, cannot do better than study Father Harper's new work, "Peace through the Church. Second series."

* Gen. xxii. † *Ib.* xlii. 21–24.

‡ *Ib.* iv. 4; xxxiii. 20; xxxv. 7. § *Ib.* xvii. 23. ‖ *Ib.* xiv.

people in the land of Egypt, from whence, by terrible judgments, they were delivered by God and His servant Moses, and conducted into the wilderness of Judea. In this dreary waste the law of God was promulgated, as far as we know, for the first time in a specific manner. We have seen that in the ante-diluvian age, the elements of the moral law had been delivered in some form or other by Almighty God, in which our duty to God and to our neighbour was enforced. But now the original law was proclaimed in the manner of a code, consisting of ten general commandments.*

These were divided into two tables, the one having reference to our duty to God, the other to our parents and to our fellow-creatures. In these the Unity of God is enforced: "Thou shalt have no other gods before Me"; and followed by a command that no one should make any representation of things in heaven, on the earth, or in the water, for the purpose of adoration; but this command cannot be taken as forbidding all images whatsoever, because He expressly commanded them to be made; as, for instance, the Ark of the Covenant, which was the type of the Incarnation; the Mercy-seat, which represented the attribute of God's mercy; and the two Cherubim, which were graven images of that order of angels who stand nearest the celestial throne of God.† The prohibition, then, was clearly limited to those images which had been used by the nations for the worship of false gods.

* Exod. xx. † *Ib.* xxv. 10–22.

The sanctity of the divine Name was proclaimed by another command, and the duty of homage to that Name enforced by the ordinance of keeping the seventh day holy unto the Lord. The duty of children to their parents followed, and also to our neighbours,—murder, adultery, theft, and covetousness being forbidden. In a word, these commandments constituted the whole law of charity, and which were thus summed up by our Lord, viz. love to God, and love to our neighbour.* But these ordinances were simply elementary, existing from the beginning of time and lasting till the end of the world; but they were largely amplified under the Mosaic code, and when Christ came, were still further enlarged, so as to include the regulation of the conduct of the inner man, no less than of the exterior man. This is potently explained by Christ in the Sermon on the Mount, wherein He showed that "anger without cause" amounted to murder, and an impure look was the same thing as adultery,† so far as the offending individual was concerned. And now let us consider some of those principles that govern the second table of the law.

The sanctity of marriage is the fundamental principle of the well-being of society, as the worship of the true God is the fundamental principle of the duty we all owe to Him who made us; and these two are so inseparable as to be absolutely indivisible. Society without God is simply hell upon earth. The worship of false gods was the cause of the destruction of society. This truth

* S. Matt. xxii. 37–40. † *Ib.* v. 21, 22, 28.

holds good even to this day. People are now demanding for themselves the right of worshipping God according to their own respective denomination or way of thinking; this is idolatry, for it is setting up a religion of one's own, without caring whether it is the true one or not. All worship save the true one is idolatrous in essence, and if persevered in will certainly in the end ruin the society that accepts it.

The first ordinance of God after the promulgation of the moral law was to this effect: "None of you shall approach to any that is near of kin" for the purpose of marriage. Marriages between parents and their children and their children's wives, uncles and their nieces, grandfathers and their grandchildren, sons and their stepmothers, brothers and their brothers' widow, between any one and a woman with her daughter, and between any one and two "sisters in the lifetime of one," &c., were forbidden by the law of Moses.* All these laws show how dreadful must have been the state of morals amongst people in general, especially among the neighbouring nations. These and correlative laws, then, were passed first to reform society, and to guard the Israelites from corruption.

But man was not limited yet to one wife; he might have as many wives of a lower grade as he pleased. Nor was marriage then indissoluble, for it was lawful for men to put them away; but our Lord, commenting upon this permission, expressly says, that "for the hardness"† of the

* Levit. xviii. † S. Matt. xix. 7, 8.

hearts of the people, it was permitted; from the beginning it was not so intended; and then He repeats the primeval ordinance, one wife for each man, and no more.* In truth, God legislated according to the capacities of the people to bear restraint. It is the wisdom of the physician to prescribe according to the capabilities of the patient, for an overdose might kill him. To change all at once the customs of society with respect to marriage would have been more than society in that age could have endured. Plurality of wives had been the rule, and that by permission of God; therefore to reduce the number of wives to one would have been impossible, unless an extraordinary grace had been at the same time conferred upon all. The object of the marriage-law of Moses was to limit the degree of consanguinity, within which it was not lawful for a man and woman to marry. It was reserved for Christian times to restrain every man to one consort; that is to say, when He who was full of grace and truth should come.

But with regard to these limitations there were exceptions; for instance, a man dying without children, his next brother was bound to take his widow (even if he were married) to "raise up seed" to him; and if he failed in this duty, she was directed, in the presence of the elders of the city, "to loose his shoe from off his foot and to spit in his face," and to say to him, "So shall it be done unto that man that will not build up his

* S. Matt. xix. 4–6.

brother's house."* This shows that competent authority, that is, authority of divine origin, may, as circumstances demand, dispense with the law. We observe this was done by the Apostles in the matter of circumcision, as explained in the Acts of the Apostles.†

With regard to the criminal and civil law, the principle laid down was, with respect to the person, "Life for life, eye for eye, tooth for tooth, hand for hand, foot for foot, burning for burning, wound for wound, stripe for stripe";‡ and concerning property, for damage done without evil intent, restitution; or if with intent, punishment.§

Another interesting point in the law of Moses, so far as morals were concerned, was the condition of society. That slavery was a recognized part of the law, there can be no doubt, but not in the manner the apologists for slavery maintain. God did not ordain slavery or serfdom; He simply found it, as it were, a custom universally prevailing. To abolish slavery all at once was impossible without bringing upon both slaves and their masters universal ruin. It is not even yet forgotten what havoc resulted from the sudden overthrow of slavery in the island of Jamaica and in that of St. Domingo, on the slaves obtaining, without preparation, their liberty. Demoralization to the most revolting degree followed in both instances. To suddenly emancipate men from slavery is simply to cause a violent change of masters, for

* Deut. xxv. 5–10. See also Ruth iii. iv.

† Acts xv. 1–29. ‡ Exod. xxi. 23–25. § *Ib.* xxi. xxii.

the slave untrained would simply, on getting his liberty, become the grovelling slave of his passions —a brute without its better instincts. Almighty God, then, did not abolish the slavery that was existing, but He reduced it to minimum proportions, and provided that at the end of seven years the slave should, without payment, be given his freedom.*

Such was the grand outline of the moral law of Moses, and it was admirably adapted for its purpose, first to discipline the people in the duty of obedience to law, to teach them to worship the one true God and to eschew idolatry, to enforce veneration for parents, to reassert the sanctity of the marriage estate, to regard every man as his brother, and to recognize the sacredness of property.

This great law of Moses was the standing witness of truth and justice between God and man, and between man and man, and its principles hold good for ever. It was a standing witness in the latter days of the older dispensation, and the great nations that formed the Roman dominion had an opportunity of making themselves acquainted with it, for the Scriptures had been translated into Greek nearly three centuries before Christ, and they were to be found in the great Alexandrian library; and besides, the Jews had been before then scattered in every direction, carrying with them the sacred Scriptures.

* Exod. xxi. 1–6. If a slave, from love of his master, desired to remain with him for life, then he shall bring him before the judges, and in their presence "shall bore his ear through with an aul; and he shall serve him for ever."

The law is said to be our "Schoolmaster to bring us unto Christ,"* and so it was; it prepared the chosen people for the coming Messiah; it moulded the manners of the people, notwithstanding their frequent failures, and by its stripes, formed that nation wherein was to be born, and from whence would proceed Christianity, the civilizer and regenerator of the whole world.

I have now traced the means God employed to prepare the world for Christianity. I have shown how, by the arts and sciences, the universal mind was purified and elevated; how, by the stern discipline of law, cruel no doubt in many respects, men were broken in and taught the duty of self-restraint, self-reliance (in a good sense), respect for others, and love for country; how, by the culture of the mind, the study of the deep mysteries of nature, the contemplation of things above sense, the intellect of man was gradually prepared and made fit for the contemplation of divine truth, to be revealed in the far future; how, by the system of vast empires, the whole world was placed under a severe regimen of salutary military discipline, which had the effect of both enlarging the mind and strengthening the physical powers of the human race; how, by means of the law of Moses, a model jurisprudence was divinely established, a form of worship provided for the adoration of the true God; and further, how, by the revelations made from time to time to Moses and the prophets, the hopes of a future Deliverer were

* Gal. iii. 24.

held out, by whom truth and justice would be established upon earth, the wrath of the Father appeased, our race raised within the sphere of a divine existence, and by whom, finally, the human family would regain what it had lost, and more than regain—the Paradise of God.

The long years of preparation are now closed, the ground has been tilled by the sons of Adam, material civilization has reached its summit of perfection, and the period of decay and decrepitude has begun. The eye of faith is now discerning in the far East the premonitory signs which indicate the near approach of the "Desired of all nations." The early dawn is breaking, the clouds are tinged with silver and golden hues, brilliant waves of fire are radiating from some centre as yet hidden; but soon is seen arising in glorious majesty, the aurora, —the long looked-for Orient, that was to usher in the day of everlasting truth and justice into this old benighted earth. "The morning stars" and all the sons of God now shout their glad acclaim, for the true "Corner-Stone" of the earth has arrived, and is now assuming His rightful place among the sons of men as Lord and Master of the universe.

BOOK IV.

THE EMPIRE-CHURCH.

CHAPTER I.

INTRODUCTORY.

THE period of preparation being ended, the Blessed Virgin and her divine Son—the Woman and Her Seed—having come and accomplished the great Mission they respectively had to perform upon this earth, we have now to investigate the provision our Lord made for giving effect to that Mission, during the many ages that would intervene between His first and second Advent.

What was the great object our Lord had in becoming incarnate? First that, though true and very God,—consubstantial with the Father,—He as very and true man might redeem the human race from the slavery of sin and of the devil; and secondly, that as very man, He might destroy Satan, and his numerous hosts, together with all his wicked allies in this world: and further that He might restore all things to their pristine excellence and perfection. But how did our Lord propose to effect this end? First by His death

and resurrection, and secondly by the establishment in the world of a great universal Empire-Church, which should include within its dominion, "all nations and languages,"—the heavens above and the regions below. S. John heard in vision the one universal song of praise ascending from "every creature which is in heaven, and on the earth, and under the earth, and such as are in the sea:" * that is, in the language of S. Paul, "the whole Family in heaven and in earth." †

Let us now consider what sort of Empire our Lord intended to institute. Was it to be a terrestrial or a spiritual one, a natural or a supernatural one, a dominion over the bodies or only the souls of men? The answer usually given to these queries by aliens, is, that the Kingdom and Church of Christ is simply a spiritual Society having jurisdiction only over the souls of men: but this is not true. The authority of Christ and His Empire-Church includes the whole person of man, over his body no less than his soul, for what is his body, but "the Temple of the Holy Ghost"? ‡

The sway of Christ's imperial sceptre, then, extends over all the earth, over all men, and over every living creature, in heaven, in earth, and under the earth. This Empire-Church possesses plenary authority over all persons, that is, over their bodies and souls. For be it remembered that the person of man—the subject of God's merciful solicitude—is composed of two distinct parts, the soul and the body; they both live together in eternity; they

* Rev. v. 13. † 2 Ephes. iii. 15. ‡ 1 Cor. vi. 19.

both will receive a reward or a curse; they will both enjoy either eternal bliss in heaven, or everlasting misery in hell. As both then are the subjects of salvation or woe, it follows that the jurisdiction of the Empire-Church extends to the bodies of men, no less than to their souls; and hence its jurisdiction includes within its sphere communities of men, the inhabitants of kingdoms, and of vast empires. Hence the municipal and civil laws of every country are, or ought to be, subordinate to the authority of the Empire of Christ, to this extent at least, that of necessity they must be in perfect conformity with all those laws and institutes God has ordained for the good of men in general: so much so that if the sovereign or representative of any nation has the folly to enact statutes either in opposition to, or incompatible with, the law of God, the Executive of the Imperial Kingdom of Christ upon earth, possesses the inherent prerogative, by virtue of the power of the Keys committed to him, to call him to account, to censure, admonish, and even to punish, as the circumstances of the case shall demand.

It is true that the power of the ecclesiastical Executive is in spiritual weapons, and an offending state may revenge itself by the free use of the sword, or by a contemptuous indifference to the commands or admonitions of the Minister of Christ. True, but what is the penalty of such insane proceedings? Prophesying of the future Kingdom and Church of Christ, which should include the Gentiles and their kings, who shall become its ministering servants, Isaiah says of those who

refuse to serve, "The nation and kingdom that will not serve thee shall perish; yea those nations shall be utterly wasted." * And our Lord Himself tells us that "whosoever shall fall on this Stone, shall be broken: but on whomsoever it [the Stone] shall fall, it will grind him to powder." †

This is the sentence of God Himself, against every nation that shall refuse to serve that Empire-Church, which Christ has set up for the healing of the nations; and this sentence has never yet failed to accomplish, sooner or later, its purpose upon any nation that has had the madness to oppose itself to the Executive of Christ. Where is the Roman Empire that once proudly ruled the world? It has been levelled with the ground, and its remains have now become the monuments of the victory of Christ and His Empire-Church. What has become of the Eastern Empire, once so famous? It is now under the sway of the Mussulman, the sink of impurity and the contempt of the earth. Has not every land which has raised its standard against the Lord and His anointed, been sorely afflicted and wasted? What was the result of the revolt of England in the sixteenth century from the Holy See? For many long years grinding tyranny over the people; the great rebellion culminating in the murder of the king, and the disruption of the Constitution. After the Restoration came the Revolution, followed by an intermittent civil war; then the loss of half the Empire, viz. the American Colonies. Where is the old

* Isai. lx. 12. See also Zech. xiv. 17–19. † S. Matt. xxi. 44.

German Empire so famous in history? It has long ago been broken and dissolved. True its spectre has just arisen to frighten the world, but it is not difficult to forecast its fall, and as soon as it has scourged the world, this shade of the past will be laid to rest to trouble the world no more. See how France and Spain suffer, and consider how the fall of both synchronizes with their unfaithfulness to God and His Vicar. Italy, too, holding as she does the primacy of honour among the robbers of God, is now passing through the throes of dissolution—a catastrophe truly and well deserved. "Whosoever shall fall upon this Stone shall be broken: but on whomsoever it shall fall, it will grind him to powder."* Such is the sentence of Jesus Christ against all nations and persons who resist His authority, and that of His Empire-Church.

You will no doubt ask, How are we to discern and apprehend this great universal Empire-Church of Christ? Where is it? Where is its seat of authority, and by whom is that Empire administered? In a word, is there any one on earth who claims universal jurisdiction over the bodies and souls of men of "all nations and languages"? To these queries every one, friend and foe, angel and devil, will confess with unhesitating unanimity that there is one on earth who does claim and always has claimed this universal jurisdiction, and that the seat of that authority is, rightly or wrongly, situated in the city of Rome. But you will further ask,

* S. Matt. xxi. 44.

Does Christendom admit and accept this claim? An affirmative answer, as a matter of fact, must be recorded both by friends and foes, by the numerous orders of the Angelic hosts, and by the various grades of the Satanic armies in hell. It is a fact that two-thirds of the baptized recognize the Pope as their Sovereign Pontiff, and Rome as the seat of authority.

Now if this universal Empire-Church of Christ had been a civil institution, a mere political power, all men would, as a matter of course, have admitted its pretensions, and would have recognized the Emperor as the Sovereign Ruler. To deny its authority and power under such circumstances would be the height of folly and madness, insuring the certain incarceration of such a one in some lunatic asylum. Respecting mundane matters people are tolerably logical; but in spiritual questions they are most illogical in their conclusions and in their proceedings. They admit the utter absurdity of disputing the fact of such claims to allegiance by a universal secular empire, or indeed by any empire more or less universal; but they have the temerity to ignore the authority of that truly universal Empire of Christ, whose existence all men admit as a fact, and whose seat of authority is recognized to be in the city of Rome. Is it not then, *primâ facie*, most absurd and illogical? They admit the fact of the existence of this Empire-Church, but they deny its authority, and the authority of its Executive! I repeat this is illogical and absurd; for the very fact of its universality, the very fact of the existence of its Chief,

and the very circumstance that by far the greater number of Christians are subjects of that autonomy, proves, *primâ facie*, at least, its supreme authority over all men. There is but one way of avoiding this conclusion, viz. that this Empire is the offspring of hell; or if it be the foundation of Christ, that it has become so universally corrupt, that although the fact stares us in the face, yet may we logically deny its authority. The answer to this is, that our Lord has guaranteed that "the gates of hell shall not prevail against it," * and that the Holy Ghost should abide within it "for ever," to "guide it into all truth"; † therefore it cannot be the offspring of hell, nor can it ever be the subject of corruption and dissolution.

The fact then, admitted by all, of the universality of the Kingdom and Church of Christ, and of the authority of the Sovereign Pontiff over the whole extent of dominion, proves demonstratively its divine right to rule the world, the divine prerogative of its Head, and the absolute necessity of all men—kings, communities, and nations—of submitting themselves to its dominion, under pain of destruction more or less absolute. And how is this great universal Empire-Church designated? By the "new name" ‡ foretold by Isaiah, even the "One Holy Catholic Church." This is the name of that universal Empire-Church, the existence of which, as I have said, the greater part of Christendom acknowledge, even at this day, as a fact.

You will maintain, however, that all I have

* S. Matt. xvi. 18. † S. John xiv. 16; xvi. 13. ‡ Isai. lxii. 2.

been writing is mere assertion. Yes, but many assertions are necessarily true, and need no proof. For instance, I assert that England is an Empire, that its capital is London, its chief a monarch, and that all Englishmen, Scotchmen, Irishmen, Canadians, Australians, New Zealanders, and such Hindoos, Buddhists, and Mussulmans who dwell in India, pay allegiance to Queen Victoria, and that they are in duty bound to do so. Does my assertion need any proof? Would it not be absurd to demand evidence of its truth? Would not the man who doubted the fact be regarded as little better than an idiot? What is the difference in this respect between the British Empire and the Empire of Christ? There is none whatever as regards the mere fact of existence, and the facts concerning its visible form and matter. I see before me a tangible reality, the British Empire, whose existence I cannot doubt; and I also see before me, as a substantial reality, another visible Empire, which is technically called the One Holy Catholic and Apostolic Roman Church, the real existence of which is equally patent before my eyes. True, you will say, but I question its authority, notwithstanding the passages you have quoted, viz. that "the gates of hell shall not prevail against it," and the promise of the perpetual indwelling of the Holy Ghost as its Teacher and Guide. How, then, is this difficulty—illogical and absurd though it be—to be met? What will convince you of the truth? If assertions deemed sufficient to demonstrate the fact of the existence of the British Empire are regarded as insufficient in your estimation

to prove the existence of the universal Empire of Christ and its universal jurisdiction upon earth, what evidence of its truth will be acceptable to you as conclusive? Will "the Law and the Testimony" satisfy your demands? You believe in the inspiration and divine authority of the Holy Scripture, at least of all those parts of it which you recognize as canonical, that is, those books which are "commonly received," minus the alleged Apocryphal books. You accept as evidence conclusive, the Apostolical tradition of the Church of the first five centuries. Let us, then, endeavour to test the truth of the truisms I have asserted by an authority which you accept as conclusive and infallible. I propose to proceed in the following order; viz. to prove, from the Holy Scriptures and Primitive Tradition, the absolute universality of the Kingdom and Church of God upon earth, and to show, by the various prophecies, types, and shadows, what was the original and manifest design and plan of Almighty God in respect to this Kingdom and Church; and when the times of fulfilment had arrived, in what manner He carried the same into execution.

CHAPTER II.

UNIVERSALITY.

THE point to be ascertained is this: Did Almighty God intend at the proper time to found a great and universal Empire-Church, to which "all peoples, nations, and languages" should be subject; and when the period of fulfilment had arrived, did He establish such an august Institution? If these two questions can be answered in the affirmative, and testimony adduced in proof, then it follows, as a necessary logical sequence, that that universal Empire-Church, which all men acknowledge as existing, together with its Head, its institutions, its doctrine of faith and morals, is proved to be the work of God, and not of any ambitious man, whether Priest or Layman. I say that, if the prophecies of old predict such an Institution as this, and if Christ our Lord did actually found and establish it in this world, then undoubtedly the One Holy, Catholic, Apostolic, and Roman Church,—the only body that in any degree represents the idea of universality, and the only one that claims it,—is by its very existence in the world, a positive proof of its divine original, and of its divine right to demand the spiritual allegiance of all men, under pain of eternal condemnation. I now address you in proof of the premisses, first, that God did intend

to found such an Institution, and when the time of fulfilment had arrived, actually did found it.

"To the Law and to the Testimony,"* then, let us betake ourselves, and, like the wise Bereans of old, ascertain "whether those things be so."†

Before the Incarnation there existed, as you are well aware, two great peoples in the world: the one, who were the descendants of a man called by God to be their ancestor, and by Him erected into a kingdom; the other, the various nations, which formed what in prophecy is known as the Babylo-Roman Empire. The former was an immediate creation of God Himself, the latter was the result of His Providence for certain ends, which we will discuss shortly. From these two great autonomies were to issue that great universal Empire-Church of Christ which had been planned by God from all eternity, the substance of which would be derived from the Kingdom of God's immediate creation; the outward form, the framework, and external polity being composed of the constitutional elements of the Babylo-Roman Empire.

§ 1.

Israel.

You are aware that S. Paul tells us that certain historic institutions and incidents in the Old Testament,—"the Law of Moses;" "the High-priest;" "the Sanctuary;" "the Holy of Holies;" "the

* Isai. viii. 20. † Acts xvii. 11.

Tabernacle;" "the Candlestick;" "the Table;" "Shew-bread;" "the Ark of the Covenant;" "the golden pot" containing "the Manna," "Aaron's rod," and "the Tables of the Covenant;" "the Cherubim of glory;" "the Mercy seat;" "Holy days;" "the New moon;" "the Sabbath day;" &c.,—were "shadows of good things to come," "the shadow of heavenly things," "the pattern of heavenly things,"* of which these were the prophetic figures and types, the fulfilment of which should be accomplished in that Empire-Church intended to be hereafter established. Every figure must have a body, every type an antitype, every shadow a substance, and every prediction a fulfilment; and, moreover, every historic incident in the House of Israel has its counterpart, in some form or other, in the history of the New Israel.

The land of Canaan was originally composed of seven kingdoms, the people of which were descended from Canaan, the son of Ham. Canaan is one of the types of the world-power,—that power which is under the dominion of the Evil One, whose temples were the Synagogues of Satan. The number "seven" is a numerical type, indicating fulness and completeness. Canaan, then, fitly represents the universal world-power, which is always at "enmity with God,"† whose maxims are in direct opposition to Him, whose worship is idolatrous and demoniacal.

Israel, on the other hand, is the type of the

* Col. ii. 16, 17; Heb. viii. ix. x. 1. † S. James iv. 4.

universal Kingdom of Christ, originating in one of God's election, following the precepts of the Most High, the morality of which is founded upon the divine law, and its object of worship the true God of heaven. These two—the one representing God and His universal Empire, and the other, Satan and the universal world-power, are ever in antagonism, the one endeavouring, with the authority of God and with the assistance of the Angels, to destroy that of the Evil One; the latter, by war, by persecution, by art and deceit, to circumvent and subvert the former.

The Spiritual authority is likewise described under the numeral seven, indicating fulness and completeness. It is so exhibited in the Apocalypse, for the Catholic hierarchy is compared to our solar system, and the seven stars, *i. e.* the Angels or Bishops of the seven Churches, being held and maintained in their orbits by the power of the Son of Man, "the Sun of Righteousness";* and her sevenfold spiritual Power is opposed to the sevenfold evil Power, represented by the great red dragon with "seven heads"† or kingdoms. Egypt is also regarded as the type of the kingdom of darkness, "the house of bondage,"‡ wherein dwelt the immediate agents of Satan, commonly known as magicians and sorcerers.

These types indicated without doubt those two universal Powers that are ever to be in antagonism with each other as long as this world shall last. Israel under the Law typified Israel under the

* Rev. i. 4–20. † *Ib.* xii. xiii. ‡ Exod. xx. 2; Rev. xi. 8.

Gospel; the land of Canaan, the kingdom of Egypt and the Babylo-Roman Empire represented that great monster world-Power which God, from all eternity intended, by means of His Empire-Church, to exterminate, "consuming" all the kingdoms of the earth and subduing them to the sceptre of justice.*

We will now proceed to trace some of the more important incidents in the history of Israel, regarding them as a pre-description of similar occurrences that would take place in that of the Empire-Church of Christ. Assuming, as we have a right to do, by warrant of Holy Scripture, that Old Israel is the type of the New Israel, that the latter is the substance of the shadow, the reality of the figure, the fulfilment of God's designs, long ago foreshadowed, these historical similitudes, occurring prophetically under the Mosaic and fulfilled under the Christian dispensation, will aid us in establishing the fact that God did first will to erect, and then did actually erect, one great universal Empire-Church, with one polity, governed by one undivided hierarchy, and administered by laws of uniform tendency, its people professing one Faith, and adoring one God and one Lord Jesus Christ.

1. We will begin from the period of the descent into Egypt, where we find the Israelites resident for upwards of 400 years. God having determined to deliver them from Egypt, He selected

* Dan. ii. 44.

one person,* whom He charged with this duty, arming him with power and might, the instrument for giving effect to his authority being a Rod.† Associated with him, and subject to him, was Aaron. We see clearly indicated here, that when the time should arrive for delivering this world from the slavery of the Evil One, by the establishment of a great universal Christian Empire, Christ would select one person, to whom He would deliver special powers, arming him with the Keys of heaven, directing him plenarily to absolve or bind, to confirm the Brethren, and to feed the Sheep; that is, to rule, to teach, and to feed the Princes and people of the New Israel, the universal Empire of Christ. This point I shall reserve for another part of this work.

2. The passage of the Israelites across the Red Sea is the figure of our passage through the red sea of the waters of baptism, by which we are regenerated and made members of the New Israel of God.

3. The wanderings of the children of Israel in the wilderness, the wars that ensued with the aborigines, the conquests they made under the leadership of Moses, their success when subject to his direction, and failure when in opposition to his command, represent similar incidents that would occur in the history of the Kingdom of Christ; as, for example, the wanderings of the people of God in the wilderness of this world, encountering storms and tempests, and surrounded with dangers

* Exod. iv. † *Ib. ib.* 17, 20.

of tremendous import, knowing no peace, save that of a good conscience. How powerfully is this described in the Apocalypse, the woman flying into the wilderness, where she hath a place prepared of God, where she resides under the care of the Eagle, and there nourished for the appointed time, the war raging all around, the seven-headed dragon fighting against "the remnant of her seed, which keep the commandments of God, and have the testimony of Jesus Christ."* The "Place" and the "Eagle" I shall have to consider by-and-by; but we observe how the wanderings of the children of Israel exactly typify the wanderings of the children of Christ during the period of the struggle from the Exodus to the taking of the land of Canaan, the figure of that world which the Empire-Church was intended to subdue to the sceptre of Christ our Lord.

The conquest of Canaan prefigured the conquest of the Gentile world. Joshua, the great leader of the hosts of Israel, after many bloody battles succeeded in obtaining possession of the promised land, and towards the close of his career he divided it by lot amongst the twelve tribes of Israel. So it would happen that all the armies of the Empire-Church, clad in heavenly armour and armed with the Sword of the Spirit, would march onward in confidence against that World-Power they were destined to subdue under the leadership of the true Joshua, aided by prodigies, by wonders, and by miracles.

But Joshua did not succeed in effecting the

* Rev. xii.

entire subjection of Canaan; a further period of some 400 years had yet to run before the Israelites were masters of the whole land, and before King David could ascend the throne of Jerusalem as Lord and Master of the whole kingdom. How beautifully does this foreshow the similar state of things between the fall of idolatry, in the presence of the true Ark, and the conquest of Rome, the capital of the world, and the accession of the Sovereign Pontiff to the throne of the Cæsars as the representative of Jesus Christ, the King of kings and Lord of lords, the Lord and Master of the universe, and King of the universal Empire He had constituted in the days of His Flesh.

It is to be noted that the period that intervened between the birth of Jacob—the root of the House of Israel—and the accession of King David as king of all the land, coincides with a similar period from the birth of Christ till the assumption of royal authority by the Sovereign Pontiff in the city of Rome. In each case a period of upwards of 700 years intervened before the sceptre of Christ under the Law, and the sceptre of Christ under the Gospel, became supreme in authority and power over the Old and New Israel: in the former, over the land of Canaan, now the Holy Land; and in the latter, over the then known world, as represented by its capital, the Eternal City on the seven hills.

4. But there were other points connected with the internal history of the two kingdoms which are worthy of consideration. The children of Israel were noted for their murmurings, their impatience under control, their idolatries, their rebellions, and

their schisms, the consequences of which were judgments of various degrees of severity executed against them by command of God; and, finally, their captivity and ultimate dispersion into all lands. And it is to be remembered that in the midst of all these trials, difficulties, crimes, and calamities, the autonomy of the kingdom of Israel remained intact, the kingdom and priesthood being vested in the houses of David and of Aaron, the chair or throne of Moses being the symbol of jurisdiction and authority. So much so, that when the ten tribes of Israel rebelled and revolted against that throne, and founded a separate kingdom, the unity of the true kingdom and Church of Israel remained in its full integrity. This is evident from our Lord's own words addressed to the woman of Samaria, who had said to him, "Our fathers worshipped in this mountain [Samaria]; and ye say that in Jerusalem is the place where men ought to worship." To which our Lord replied: "Ye worship ye know not what: we know what we worship: for salvation is of the Jews."* The covenant of God with Israel was with Moses and Aaron, and subsequently with Joshua, the Judge-kings, David, and with the royal and Sacerdotal Successors to the throne of Moses; therefore the kingdom of Israel, notwithstanding the schism, remained intact, for the terms of the covenant preserved in Jerusalem limited salvation to the Jews, that is, the remnant of those who remained faithful to the law of Moses.

Now all these events in the history of Israel

* S. John iv. 20–22.

have their counterpart in the history of Christ's universal Empire-Church. Many of the subjects of this Empire-Church have at various periods, as we know, murmured and rebelled against the authority of Christ. Many have committed idolatry, which according to Scripture language signifies "fornication," with "the kings of the earth,"* worshipping the creature before the Creator, and relying upon the power of Cæsar rather than upon that of Christ. The rebellions of Korah, Dathan, and Abiram are fit representatives of the many heresiarchs that have appeared from time to time, setting themselves up against the authority of the Moses of their day; as, for instance, Montanus, Valentinus, Novatian, Marcion, Arius, Nestorius, Eutyches, &c. &c., all of whom were, in their time, leaders of many against the authority the Church has set up.

These prophetic-historical incidents in the history of the kingdom under the Law, agreeing as they do almost minutely with similar events in the Kingdom under the Gospel, were, to say the least, most remarkable coincidences; and it is impossible to believe that they were accidental; for everything connected with the history of the chosen people was ordained by God for the very purpose of foreshowing, as S. Paul and S. Peter clearly state, by "shadow," by "figure," and by "type," the outline of the great history of that Empire-Church, which Christ intended to establish before His ascension to the right hand of the Father.

* Rev. xviii. 3.

The land of Canaan then was the figure of the world: the people of Israel the great body of Christians, subject to the authority of Christ, as represented upon earth. The wanderings of the Children of Israel typified the Kingdom of Christ in the wilderness of this world: the taking of Canaan, the conversion of the world: the final conquest of the land and the coronation of David as king, the fall of Rome and the accession of Christ in the person of His Vicar to the throne of the Cæsars: and the sins, enormities, rebellions, and schisms of large numbers of the people shadowed forth similar catastrophes in the Kingdom under the Gospel. Old Israel, with its history and institutions, prefigured New Israel, the one being local, *i. e.* in the land of Canaan, the other universal, having the world—which Canaan typified—for its dominion. And inasmuch as the schism of the ten tribes did not result in the dissolution of the divine polity, so no more would the schisms, in the East and West, or any other that may in future occur, mar in the slightest degree the unity of that Kingdom, which, as I shall point out in a subsequent part of my work, is indivisible and indefectible.

5. The next point I desire to refer to is the similarity of the two forms in which the constitutions of Old and New Israel were originally cast. Jacob was the root of the house of Israel, and in this character he is the figure of Christ, as the root of the future Israel. To Jacob were born twelve sons, who became the twelve patriarchs, and the ancestors of the twelve tribes, among which, according to their families, the whole land after the conquest

of Canaan was divided. The chiefs of these tribes were the princes or heads of the kingdom of Israel, and as such were associated in the government of the nation. Of these twelve tribes and their princes, one, together with its chief, was supreme, to whom was committed by God the sovereign authority.

Next in order were the Elders or Ancients, seventy* in number, who formed the Council of the Sanhedrim. There were also Rulers—"Rulers of thousands," and "of hundreds," and "Rulers of the congregation"; these "were wise men, and understanding and known among" the "tribes," whom Moses made "Rulers" over the people.† The counterpart of this political arrangement we find in the Empire-Church of Christ. Christ is the true Jacob, *i.e.* the true Israel of God. To Him as the Son of Man was communicated the gift of fecundity, for He spiritually begat twelve Princes, who became the twelve Patriarchs of the New Israel. "I appoint unto you a Kingdom, as My Father has appointed unto Me; that ye may eat and drink at My table in My Kingdom, and sit on thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel." ‡ Among these, like the typical Israel, the whole land of the New Israel—*i. e.* the whole earth—was divided, as is evident from the commission, "Go ye therefore and make disciples of all nations . . . . teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you," § &c., while one of the

* Numb. xi. 25. † Deut. i. 13. ‡ S. Luke xxii. 29, 30.
§ S. Matt. xxviii. 19, 20.

number, like Judah of old, was elected by Christ to be the Supreme Head and Sovereign.

The seventy Elders or Ancients under the law find their places in the Gospel: "After these things the Lord appointed other seventy also, and sent them two and two before His face into every city and place, whither He Himself would come." * This office was continued by the Apostles, for it is said that they appointed them in every city.† Rulers, too, were likewise constituted, but whether bishops or priests is not precisely stated. Deacons, also, answering to the Levites of old, were instituted by the Apostles.‡

The parallel between the two Kingdoms of God is complete, Old Israel prefiguring the New in every particular, in the form of its constitution—Sovereign, Princes, Elders or Ancients, Rulers, &c. The Priesthood likewise figured that of the Church, viz. the High-priest, the Chief Priests, the ordinary Priests, and the Levites; the antitypes, being our Lord Jesus Christ and His Vicar, the Episcopate, the Presbytery, the Diaconate, and other orders.

But now we arrive at a very noteworthy point of history in both these kingdoms:—The twelvefold form of the constitution was not destined to be perpetual; for the essential features in both were that both the kingdom and the Empire-Church were to be vested in one tribe, and in its Sovereign Head or King.

The revolt and fall of the ten tribes of the civil House of Israel show clearly enough that they

* S. Luke x. 1. † S. Titus i. 5. ‡ Acts vi. 1–4.

were not essentially necessary for the preservation of the integrity of the kingdom and Church under the law. No more was it so in the Empire-Church of God. All the principal thrones established by the Apostles in the various parts of the world, with the exception of the Apostolic See, have at various times fallen from the Faith, denied the Lord Jesus Christ, and resisted the authority of that single Chair or Throne which Christ, in the person of S. Peter, erected in the midst of Imperial Rome; and to this day their *lineal* successors (so to speak) are both heretics and schismatics. As, then, the ancient kingdom and Church of God was after the revolt of the tribes, limited to that of Judah, so has it come to pass that the Empire-Church of Christ is composed exclusively of those who are in visible communion with the Holy Apostolic See, in which sits the Successor of the Apostle Peter, the Prince of the Apostles. The parallel is perfect; the anti-type agrees with the type, the substance with the figure, the historic-fulfilment with the historic-prophecy.

How beautifully, how wonderfully, and how exactly did Israel of Old forecast, by type and shadow, and by historic incidents, the New Israel of God, its form and shape, its constitution, its monarchy, aristocracy, and ministry; every part and feature, indeed, of the one coinciding and fitting into every part and feature of the other, every incident in the history of the Old having its counterpart in the history of the New. The local kingdom of Israel thus foreshadowed the New Israel—the universal Empire-Church of Christ.

§ 2.

Prophecy.

I proceed now to produce direct Scripture evidence in proof of the Universality of the Empire-Church.

The promises made to the great Patriarchs will first engage our attention. "I will make thy seed [Abraham's] as the dust of the earth; so that if a man can number the dust of the earth, then shall thy seed also be numbered."* "Seeing that Abraham shall surely become a great and mighty nation, and all the nations of the earth shall be blessed in him."† "Neither shall thy name any more be called Abram, but thy name shall be Abraham; for a father of many nations have I made thee. I will make thee exceeding fruitful, and I will make nations of thee, and kings shall come out of thee."‡ These promises were confirmed to Isaac and Jacob. But to Jacob our Lord was more explicit: "And, behold, the Lord stood above it [*i. e.* the Ladder connecting heaven and earth, which Jacob saw in vision, and which is a type of the Incarnation], and said, I am the Lord God of Abraham thy father, and the God of Isaac: the land whereon thou liest, to thee will I give it, and to thy seed; and thy seed shall be as the dust of the earth, and thou shalt spread abroad to the West, and to the East, and to the North, and to the South: and in thee and in thy seed shall all the families

* Gen. xiii. 16. † *Ib.* xviii. 18. ‡ *Ib.* xvii. 5, 6.

of the earth be blessed."* And in the benediction Jacob pronounced upon Ephraim, he said: "Truly his younger brother [Ephraim] shall be greater than he, and his seed shall become a multitude of nations."† It is evident that these promises could never have been exhaustively fulfilled in the kingdom of Israel, and in the kingdoms of the children of Abraham contiguous to the Holy Land. The promises point to a people so numerous as to be absolutely countless, spreading westward, eastward, northward, and southward, that is, a people who should cover, in the course of ages, the whole extent of this world;—in a word, a people who, in the aggregate, would form that universal Empire it was intended ultimately to establish upon earth. And I must also add, that the dominion of this Empire is not limited by the confines of this earth; it includes the heavens above, and the regions under the earth. For the descendants of Abraham in these three divisions of the universal Empire of Christ are represented in the Apocalypse as uniting in the great and tremendous song of praise, which ascends day and night to the great white Throne of God and to the Lamb who liveth for ever and ever. Nothing short of this exhausts the promises of God made to Abraham, that his seed should be as numerous as the dust of the earth, so that "if a man can number the dust of the earth, then shall thy seed be numbered."

The fulfilment of these prophetic passages

* Gen. xxviii. 13, 14. † *Ib.* xlviii. 19.

began to be fulfilled on the conquest of Canaan; it is fulfilling even now, but the full accomplishment will not be till the consummation. Are we, then, Jews? Are we of the seed of Abraham according to the flesh? for the promises were that *thy seed*—*i. e.* Abraham's—shall become the father of nations and kings, in which all the families of the earth shall be blessed. S. Paul explains this: "For the promise, that he [Abraham] should be the heir of the world, was not to Abraham, or to his seed, through the law, but through the righteousness [or, rather the justice] of faith. For if they which are of the law be heirs, faith is made void, and the promise made of none effect. . . . Therefore it is of faith, that it might be by grace; to the end the promise might be sure to all the seed: not to that only which is of the law, but to that also which is of the faith of Abraham; who is the father of us all."* We are, then, of the seed of Abraham. How so?

S. Paul in another part of his epistle, writing concerning the fall of Israel and the substitution of the Gentiles in its place, says, "And if some of the branches be broken off, and thou [the Romans, *i. e.* the Gentiles], being a wild olive-tree, wert graffed in among them, and with them partakest of the root and fatness of the olive-tree; boast not against the branches. But if thou boast, thou bearest not the root, but the root thee. Thou wilt say then, The branches were broken off, that I might be graffed in. Well; because of unbelief,

* Rom. iv. 13–16.

they were broken off, and thou standest by the faith."* Israel is here represented by the "olive-tree," the Gentiles, that is ourselves (so far as concerns this passage), are described as a "wild olive." This "wild olive" is, we are told, "graffed," or to use a more modern word, engrafted, into the olive-tree, so much so that the two trees become one and the same thing. The "root," in this passage, is Abraham, who is the root of the former holy people, and he is likewise the root of the Gentiles, who believe in Christ, by their being engrafted on that stem or branch which issued from him. The union then, according to the argument of the Apostle, is complete, the Empire-Church made one with the Jewish race, nourished by the same sap derived from one root, namely Abraham. Thus, then, Abraham is our Father, in some sense, in the flesh; for as S. Chrysostom says, we partaking "'of the root and fatness of the olive,' have been placed in the same noble rank" as "the Jew," and "the same nature."†

But further, how are we "graffed into the olive-tree"? By Jesus Christ, who was and is of the Seed of Abraham, according to the flesh; and we who believe in Him, and are of the body of the Faithful, are His Family, being Children of God by adoption, that is by our being "graffed" in Him, the true "Olive" or "Vine," and thus made His members or branches; for the aggregate of true believers form that Church and Kingdom,

* Rom. xi. 17–20.

† Oper. S. Chrysost., Hom. xix. t. ix. in Rom. n. 4.

which in Holy Scripture is described as His Body of which He is the Head. This union with Christ is exhaustively explained by the same great Apostle, when he says that "we are members of His Body, of His Flesh and of His Bones."*

These terms are so strong, and so emphatic, that they imply a union of our substance with the substance of the humanity of Christ; and, indeed, if we compare this language with the "graffing in" of the "wild olive into the olive-tree," both becoming substantially one, so that they are, as has just been observed, nourished with the same sap, the issue of one common root, it seems impossible to resist the conclusion that Christ and ourselves are both of the same substance. Is this so? The text above quoted is a clause of the preceding verses. The Apostle admonishing husbands, says, "So ought men to love their wives as their own bodies. He that loveth his wife loveth himself. For no man ever yet hated his own flesh; but nourisheth and cherisheth it, even as the Lord the Church: for we are members of His Body, of his Flesh, and of His Bones. For this cause shall a man leave his father and mother, and shall be joined unto his wife, and they two shall be one flesh. This is a great mystery [or sacrament]; but I speak concerning Christ and His Church." †

Now this passage carries us back to the primeval marriage of Adam and Eve, and here we shall find the solution of this question. When God determined to provide a consort for Adam, what did He

* Eph. v. 30. † *Ib.* 28–32.

do? He "caused a deep sleep to fall upon Adam and he slept: and He took one of his ribs, and closed up the flesh instead thereof," and from this rib "made He a woman, and brought her" to Adam. Adam then exclaimed, "This is now bone of my bones, and flesh of my flesh; she shall be called Woman, because she was taken out of man. Therefore shall a man leave his father and mother, and shall cleave unto his wife; and they shall become one flesh."* The substance of Adam and the substance of Eve according to the flesh was the same, the latter being body of his body, flesh of his flesh, and bone of his bones. The union between Christ and the Church is the same; for when sleeping on the Cross, His side was opened, from which issued Blood and Water, that is the Sacraments, by means of which we are born into the Family of Christ, and made thereby one with Him and He with us.

The Church, then, is His Spouse, she being taken out of His side, and is consequently of the same substance with Him, even as Eve was of the same substance with Adam, and was presented to Him as a Bride "without any spot or wrinkle"; and as Adam declared that Eve was bone of his bones and flesh of his flesh, so the second Adam, Christ, accepted His Spouse in like manner, as "body of His Body, flesh of His Flesh, and bone of His Bones."

S. Chrysostom has a remarkable commentary on the words "of His Body, of His Flesh, and of His

* Gen. ii. 21–24.

Bones." He says, "How so? in that He was of our substance, as Eve also was made flesh from the flesh of Adam. And well does he (Paul) make mention of 'bones' and 'flesh;' for these are principal things about us, our flesh and bones, the one being laid underneath, as a sort of foundation, the other as a sort of superstructure. However, it is clear as to the former case, but how can this be of the latter? as in that case there is so close a relation, so he would say there is also here. What means of 'His Flesh'? It means really from Him. And how are we then 'members of Christ'? In that we have been begotten as He Himself [was begotten]. And how of His Flesh? You know; as many as do partake of the mysteries [*i. e.* the Sacraments]. For by Him we are created anew. But how? Hear again this blessed Saint, when he saith, 'Forasmuch, then, as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, so also Himself likewise took part of the same.' Here only He imparts to us, not we to Him. How then are we of 'His Flesh, and of His Bones'? Some say that it is the 'blood and water' are meant; but it is not so. But what he means to express is this, that like as without conjugal union He was begotten of the Holy Ghost, so also are we begotten in the laver [*i. e.* by Baptism]. Mark, how many are the examples to establish the faith of that conception. Oh, the madness of the heretics! That which be once born of water, whatever it is that is born, that they confess to be a true birth; but that we are made His Body that they admit not. And yet if we do not become so, how will the expression 'of His Flesh and of His Bones' be compatible?

But mark, Adam was created, Christ is born. From Adam's side entered in corruption. From the side of Christ welled forth life. In Paradise sprang up death, in His Cross was effected its destruction. As, then, the Son of God is of our nature, so are we of His substance; and as He hath us in Himself, so have we also Him in us."*

S. Chrysostom says that "as the Son of God is of our nature, so are we of His substance; and as He hath us in Himself, so also have we Him in us." And the means whereby this union of "substance" is effected is by the mysteries or Sacraments of the Church. And this union is not a mere spiritual one, *i.e.* without any substantial reality, but as this same Father says, "really so," that is, as he more than implies, "we are made His Body." We are then of the Seed of Abraham, by virtue of our union with the Body of Christ, and consequently we form part of that immense multitude of his Children, which are as countless as the "dust of the ground," the "sand of the sea," and the "stars of heaven."

But before we dismiss this part of our subject, we must consider what is understood here by "substance," or rather we must distinguish. The children of Abraham under the law are so by carnal generation; those under the Gospel by virginal generation. Our Lord, according to His Humanity, is the link between the former and the latter generations. He Himself was virginally conceived in the womb of His Virgin Mother, ever

* Oper. S. Chrysost., t. xi. in Ephes., Hom. xx. n. 3, 4.

blessed; but He was at the same time of the carnal seed of Abraham. The relationship of Christ with us is virginal, we being begotten in baptism, and born into His Family by the Holy Ghost, become so united as to be of the same substance with Him, and thus made "body of His Body, flesh of His Flesh, and bone of His Bones." We are therefore of the seed of Christ in a virginal sense, but none the less real and true, than He was carnally of the seed of Abraham.

The prophecy, then, addressed to the Patriarchs of old pointed to the establishment of a great universal Empire-Church, which should overflow the whole world, North, South, East, and West, and composed of a great people, who should be the children of Abraham, "of the same nature with him," as S. Chrysostom says, being "graffed" into the stock of his race, and this through Jesus Christ by a virginal yet real generation; for as the same Father remarked, "that like as, without conjugal union, He was begotten of the Holy Ghost, so also are we begotten [by Him] in the laver [of Baptism], and made members" of His Flesh "by being partakers of the mysteries."

2. We have already seen how the kingdom and Church of Israel was the figure, the type, and the shadow of the Empire and Church of Christ. Let us now see how the reality, the antitype and the substance, was to come into existence:—"Sing, O barren, thou that didst not bear; break forth into singing, and cry aloud, thou that didst not travail with child; for more are the children of the deso-

late than the children of the married wife, saith the Lord." * The Jewish kingdom and Church was nothing but a figure and a shadow; its king was a typical monarch, representing Him who was the true Sovereign; its High-priests, a type of the true High-priest; its sacrifice and oblation mere substitutes for the reality; and its very people were but the embryo of that great race which should hereafter people the universal Empire of the Redeemer.

But the barren woman was in the fulness of time to receive life, and then to "break forth," according to the promises made to Jacob, "westward, eastward, northward, and southward," until it should include within its embrace the entire world; and then Jerusalem, its sanctuary, and its priesthood ("changed" † indeed, as S. Paul says) should no longer be located in a single city, but everywhere, in every city, in every town, and in every village throughout the world. "Sing O barren," "for more are the children of the desolate than the children of the married wife." "Enlarge the place of thy tent, and let them stretch forth the curtains of thine habitations: spare not, lengthen thy cords, and strengthen thy stakes; for thou shalt break forth on the right hand and on the left; and thy seed shall inherit the Gentiles, and make the desolate cities to be inhabited. Fear not; for thou shalt not be ashamed; neither be thou confounded; for thou shalt not be put to shame: for thou shalt forget the shame of thy

* Isai. liv. 1. † Heb. vii. 12.

youth, and shalt not remember the reproach of thy widowhood any more. For thy Maker is thine Husband; the Lord of Hosts is His Name; and thy Redeemer the Holy One of Israel; the God of the whole earth shall he be called." * And Malachi following up the prophecy says, "For from the rising of the sun even unto the going down of the same My Name shall be great among the Gentiles; and in every place incense shall be offered to My Name, and a pure offering; for My Name shall be great among the heathen, saith the Lord of Hosts." † We see how the seed of Abraham was to expand until it embraced the whole earth: how Jerusalem from a local city was to become a universal one, as S. Paul describes it, "the Household of God"; how the Altar of the Temple was to be set up everywhere, and how the Seed of the Israelites was to inherit the Gentiles, that is, that Seed which in, by, and through Christ, the Redeemer, should become the true Seed of Abraham, the true Israel of God.

3. This prophecy is still further unfolded by the visions vouchsafed in the Book of Daniel: I shall only here touch on one point, as I shall have to discuss them in connection with the Babylo-Roman Empire. At present I only allude to the Stone, that is the "Stone of Israel," even Christ and His servant whom He named Rock, which fell upon the feet of the Figure that was presented in vision to the King of Babylon, and broke it to pieces; which Stone, it is said, "became a great mountain,

* Isai. liv. 2–5. † Mal. i. 11.

and filled the whole earth." This is explained by Daniel to signify the Kingdom of God, "which should break in pieces and consume all these kingdoms, and it shall stand for ever."* Here we have a distinct pre-announcement of the future estalishment of that great Empire-Church, which should strike all the kingdoms of the world, and take possession of them.

This kingdom is derived from the Stone, that is the seed of Abraham and Jacob, which it was foretold would become so numerous, that if it were possible to count the dust of the ground, or the stars of heaven, then might it be counted. From these prophecies we observe four things: first, that the kingdom of Israel was the womb of the Kingdom of Christ; secondly, that from it would issue a New Israel that should be similar to the Old, with this difference, that it would be the Reality and not the Figure; thirdly, that this New Israel would be Christ Himself, the true Jacob-Prince, and "of His seed," which "shall inherit the earth";† and lastly, that it would become universal, all nations, peoples, and languages being born unto Him in the laver of Regeneration, and nurtured by Him through the blessed Sacraments of the Gospel.

4. I conclude this section by bringing before you the following prophecies confirmatory of the above:—

"Yet have I set My King upon My holy hill of Zion . . . . Ask of Me, and I shall give thee the heathen for thine inheritance, and the uttermost

* Dan. ii. 44. † Ps. xxv. 13, and Isai. liii. 10.

parts of the earth for thy possession."* "All the ends of the world shall remember and turn unto the Lord: and all the kindreds of the nations shall worship before Thee." † "He shall have dominion also from sea to sea, and from the river unto the ends of the earth." ‡ Two points are here evident, that the dominion of Christ was to extend not only over the chosen people and the land of Israel, but also over all the heathen, who would ultimately submit to the Cross of Christ, and over every part of the earth; and that He would reign over all not merely as God, to whom all things originally and by right belong, but as the true Man—the Second Adam,—even Him who is the Son of Mary, to whom God has given all things as His possession. By virtue then of this grant, obtained by the shedding of His Blood,—the price paid for redemption,—He has merited to become the absolute possessor of this world, which in point of fact has become His property. The whole earth, then, inclusive of all its inhabitants, without any exception, is the freehold possession of the Lord Jesus Christ, over which He reigns as King of kings and Lord of lords. This great truth will come out in reality as we proceed.

"And it shall come to pass in the last days, that the Mountain of the Lord's House shall be established in the top of the mountains, and shall be exalted above the hills; and all nations shall flow unto it." § A mountain is the symbol of both a city and a place of sacrifice. Jerusalem is

* Ps. ii. 6, 8. † *Ib.* xxii. 27. ‡ *Ib.* lxxii. 8.
§ Isai. ii. 2.

the great Mountain of the City and House of God, that is of His Kingdom and Church. Isaiah says, that "in the last days," that is after the coming of Christ, the Kingdom and Church of God shall no longer be limited geographically to a single city and state, but shall cover "the top of the mountains, and shall be exalted above" them: that is to say, as we shall see hereafter, that all the mountains, that is all the cities of the world, shall be included in the dominion of Christ, one of them, even Mount Sion, being superior over them as Chief and Head. The passages, already quoted, which state how that the Tabernacle of Jerusalem will be expanded so as to include all the Gentiles within its circumference, and another, how that the daily sacrifice will be offered, not in Jerusalem only, but in every place, clearly demonstrate this truth.

"Arise, shine; for thy Light is come, and the glory of the Lord is risen upon thee. For, behold the darkness shall cover the earth, and gross darkness the people: but the Lord shall arise upon thee, and His glory shall be seen upon thee. And the Gentiles shall come to thy Light, and kings to the brightness of thy rising." "Gross darkness shall cover the earth": such was the case when Christ the true Light came; all nations were groping about in the dark, being as brute beasts without any real knowledge of the true God. Doubtless, now and then great heathens arose, and by the power of their mind and intellect, pierced to some distance into the density of the blackness all around; but they never reached even the threshold of the gates of knowledge. Even the eyes of

the Jews, to whom God had revealed His will and intentions, were covered with a film, so that they could not discern the truth through the mist with which they had enveloped themselves. The Christ the orient of the world came; He who was the Light descended upon the darkness, and made manifest to all men the way that leadeth to eternal life. "And the Gentiles," that is the whole world, "shall come to Thy Light." But the Light here is twofold, or rather of two sorts, the one being Christ Himself, the Light of the world, the Sun that illuminates and rules the intelligent world; and the Kingdom and Church of Christ, which like the planets borrow their light from the Sun, *i. e.* Christ. The whole Kingdom and Church of Christ is compared in the Apocalypse to the solar system. Christ is the Sun; the stars represent the one indivisible hierarchy of the kingdom and Church of Christ. Here we see how the idea of the universal Empire-Church of Christ is unfolded, and under the figure of the solar system (which to our minds conveys the idea of universality) brought home to our understanding.

The Prophet continues, "Lift up thine eyes round about and see: all they gather themselves together, they come to thee; thy sons shall come from far, and thy daughters shall be nursed at thy side. Then shalt thou see, and flow together, and thine heart shall fear, and be enlarged; because the abundance of the sea shall be converted unto thee, the forces of the Gentiles shall come unto thee"; and so on, showing how great would be the multitude and the riches that

would accrue to this great Empire-Church. "Surely the isles shall wait for Me, and the ships of Tarshish first, to bring thy sons from far, their silver and their gold with them, unto the Name of the Lord thy God, and to the Holy One of Israel, because He hath glorified thee. And the sons of strangers [*i.e.* the Gentiles] shall build up thy walls, and their kings shall minister unto thee: for in My wrath I smote thee, but in My favour have I had mercy upon thee. Therefore thy gates shall be open continually; they shall not be shut day nor night; that men may bring unto thee the forces of the Gentiles, and that their kings may be brought .... Thou shalt also suck the milk of the Gentiles, and shalt suck the breast of kings: and thou shalt know that I the Lord am thy Saviour and thy Redeemer, the mighty One of Jacob .... The sun shall be no more thy light by day; neither for brightness shall the moon give light unto thee: but the Lord shall be unto thee an everlasting Light, and thy God thy glory."*

There are some who think that this prophecy concerns literal Israel and Jerusalem; but not so; it concerns the New Israel and the New Jerusalem, which now consist of the universal Empire-Church of Christ, and that City which reigns over the earth in the name of Jesus Christ. This and the preceding prophecy are thus expanded and unfolded in the Apocalypse: "And He carried me away in the spirit to a great and high mountain, and showed me that great City, the holy Jerusalem,

* Isai. lx.

descending out of heaven from God, having the glory of God; and her Light was like unto a Stone most precious, even like a jasper stone clear as crystal; and had a wall great and high, and had twelve gates, and at the gates twelve angels [*i.e.* Bishops], and names written thereon, which are the names of the Twelve Tribes of the children of Israel .... And the wall of the City had twelve foundations, and in them the names of the Twelve Apostles of the Lamb .... And the City lieth four-square" (the length, breadth, and height being equal); "and he measured the City with the reed, twelve thousand furlongs ... and the wall thereof an hundred and forty and four cubits, according to the measure of a man, that is of the angel. And the building of the wall of it was of jasper; and the City was pure gold, like unto clear glass. And the foundations of the wall of the city were garnished with all manner of precious stones. The first foundation was jasper [the rest of other precious stones]. And the twelve gates were twelve pearls.... And the City had no need of the sun, neither of the moon, to shine in it; for the glory of God did lighten it, and the Lamb is the Light thereof. And the nations of them which are saved shall walk in the light of it, and the kings of the earth shall bring their glory and their honour into it.... And there shall in nowise enter into it anything that defileth, neither whatsoever worketh abomination, or maketh a lie, but they which are written in the Lamb's book of life."*

The great and high mountain is the seat of the

* Rev. xxi. 10–27.

Empire, the precious stones, of which the jasper is the chief: the gold, &c., symbolize its material glory; the figure of the square, equal in height, depth, and breadth, indicates perfection: the Twelve gates show how it is open to all who come in the name of Christ, the Twelve foundations its amazing strength, and the height of the wall, its impregnability. The area of the mighty City, twelve thousand furlongs, its universality (for twelve is a perfect number; and the number one hundred and forty-four cubits, another mystical number, signifies perfection, that is twelve times twelve). No sun or moon is needed, for Christ is the Sun, and the "angels," the "Apostles" and their successors, are the constellations that illuminate the great divine firmament of the Universal Church of Christ. We see, then, how the Apocalypse explains and unfolds the meaning of Isaiah; he did not foretell a renewal of the Jerusalem under the Law, but of the Jerusalem under the Gospel, pointing out the great and high Mountain, the seat of the authority of Christ, and the four-square City, the great Empire-Church of the Redeemer.

There are many other passages I might quote, but these are sufficient for the present purpose, viz. to show that from the very beginning God formed the design of establishing upon earth a great universal Empire-Church, complete in all its parts, to which all nations should be subject under pain of annihilation; and that it should be composed of peoples of all nations, who should become by means of the Sacraments united substantially with Christ, as much so as Adam and Eve were

one flesh, and more so; and should thereby become "members of His Body, of His Flesh, and His Bones"; and thus they would be of the Seed of Abraham, the number of which should be as countless "as the dust on the ground," "the sand of the sea," or "the stars of heaven."

§ 3.

The Babylo-Roman Empire.

In a former part of this epistle I endeavoured to show that the Roman dominion was one of the means appointed by Almighty God to prepare the world for the reception of the great truths of the Gospel; but it seems that it was intended to do far more than this. The Church is often compared to a ship, the fabric being composed of the shell or outward part, the occupants consisting of the captain, the officers, the sailors, and the passengers. The ship's company is one thing, the material vessel, with its departments and arrangements, another. I showed above how the substance of the Kingdom and Church of Christ was drawn from the Seed of Abraham, with which we are substantially one through Christ, ourselves being really and truly, by means of the Sacraments, made "members of His Body, of His Flesh, and of His Bones."

Now we have to consider the material fabric (so to speak) of that Kingdom and Church, its outward form and administrative arrangements, which seem

to have been modelled after the polity or autonomy of the Babylo-Roman Empire. This assertion may seem at first sight a contradiction to what has been stated in a preceding section, viz., that Christ had instituted a twelve-fold Apostolate similar in form to the twelve-fold Patriarchate under the Mosaic dispensation. There is, however, no contradiction, for the Apostolate, as a college *of twelve*, was not intended to be a permanent institution, so far as the visible Church was concerned, and hence it did not prove an essential feature in the constitution of the Empire-Church; no more, at least, than the twelve-fold princedom in the older dispensation. As in the case of the kingdom of Israel so it was in that of the Empire-Church, when the greater part of the patriarchal and the apostolic thrones revolted against the chief throne—under the Law the chair of Moses, and under the Gospel the Chair of Peter—the government reverted to the exclusive authority of the Sovereign Power, which had been instituted by God, respectively for both dispensations, viz. the house of Judah and the See of Peter, the Prince of the Apostles. And further, there never was apparently any intention on the part of our Lord to continue the Apostolate, as He had constituted it, in *all* the successors of the Apostles. The gift of inspiration was to cease altogether, and that of infallibility in matters of faith and morals—this is to say, if it is true that the Apostles, individually and independently of their brethren, were infallible—was no longer to be a privilege attached to the various Apostolic Sees, except in the case of the Apostolic See of Rome,

to which it became an exclusive heritage. Then, again, you must bear in mind that no bishop, succeeding immediately to an Apostolic See, ever claimed the dignity and privilege of Apostles; no, not even did the Patriarchs ever lay claim to such a position.

One line of Successors only did assert Apostolic prerogatives (that of inspiration excepted), viz. the Prelates of the Holy Apostolic See of Rome, and this position was accepted universally by the whole Church from the very beginning. It is plain then, from all these circumstances, that the twelvefold form of the constitution of the Empire-Church was not destined to continue, but, like Israel of old, the governmental and teaching offices reverted exclusively to the See of the Prince of the Apostles. And besides, it was evidently intended from the very beginning that the Gentile world should be included in the covenant of the New Israel; and the Jewish and Gentile economies, adapted to Christian faith and morals, were to be amalgamated, and to form henceforth one great Christian polity.

Let us examine this point. Upon investigating the constitution and regimen of the Empire-Church of Christ as our Lord planned and the Apostles executed, it would appear that the design has a remarkable affinity to the Roman autonomy; indeed, in every particular the resemblance is so exact as to suggest the probability, even if there were no Scripture proofs, that Babylo-Rome was a creation of God, for the express purpose of providing the future Empire-Church of Christ with a

polity exactly suited to its necessities. Let us in the first place examine into some of these similitudes.

1. Rome Pagan was founded by two brothers, Romulus and Remus, who were, as it is supposed, nourished by a wolf; Rome Christian was likewise founded by two brothers in the Faith, S. Peter and S. Paul, and both were nurtured, not indeed by a wolf, but by a Lamb,—the former, the type of the devil; the latter, of Christ the true Lamb. The etymological derivation of the two chief founders, Romulus and Peter, have a similarity, both signifying *strength* and *power*.

2. The constitution of Rome varied at different times: at first it was a simple monarchy, secondly a republic, thirdly an aristocracy, and lastly an autocracy. In the Empire-Church of Christ these three forms of government coexist in perfect harmony, the result of which is the utmost liberty compatible with good government. In the spiritual department of the pagan State there was a college consisting of the Pontifex Maximus and the Pontifices, who regulated all religious matters within the state, the former being supreme and absolute in the college. At first, the jurisdiction of the pagan supreme Pontiff was limited to the great city, but subsequently this office became extended when it was annexed to the purple, and then its authority was co-extensive with that of the Emperor. In the Empire of Christ we have precisely the same sort of office, the Pontifex Maximus and the Pontifices,—the former filled by Peter and his Successors at Rome, the latter in union with their

Chief, *i. e.* the true Pontifical College, consisting of the true Pontifex Maximus and the Pontifices, commonly known as the episcopate. The Pope was identified with this title as early as the second century, which gave such umbrage to the Emperors that they endeavoured to exterminate, one after another, every Prelate of the Holy See. Tertullian witnesses to the fact that the Pope was known in his day as the "Pontifex Maximus."* S. Cyprian informs us that after the martyrdom of S. Fabian, the Emperor said he would rather endure a rival to his throne than that another "Priest of God" (meaning Pontifex Maximus) should be appointed in Rome.† And the Emperor Aurelian seems to allude to some such office when he adjudged that the temporalities of the See of Antioch should "be given up to those whom the Christian Prelates of Italy and the Bishop of Rome should appoint."‡

3. The great political divisions of the Roman Empire were most suitable for the Kingdom of Christ; indeed, they seem evidently a pre-ordained arrangement, a pre-mapping of the world, as it were, for the convenience of the Empire-Church. The Empire was divided into thirteen dioceses, and about a hundred and twenty provinces, and a large number of parishes (districts answering to the more modern dioceses). The three chief were Rome, Alexandria, and Antioch, and the rest were of lesser dignity. The Empire-Church was similarly constituted. S. Peter, the Head of the Apostolic

* Opera Tertull., De Pudicit., c. i.

† Opera S. Cyp., Ep. lii. ad Antonian.

‡ Eus. H. E., vii. c. 30.

College, took possession in succession of the three great capitals of the Roman Empire: (1) Antioch; (2) Rome, where he remained, and therein erected his Cathedra; and (3) Alexandria, to which he sent S. Mark in his name. The succeeding bishops of these three Sees were called Patriarchs, the Head of whom was the Patriarch of Rome. The prelates of the other diœceses were known as Exarchs; as, for instance, Ephesus, Cæsarea, Heraclea afterwards Constantinople, Thessalonica, Sardinia, Milan, Sirmium, Carthage, Spain, Gaul, York.* Under these greater and lesser Patriarchs there were one hundred and twenty metropolitans of provinces, and under them, again, the bishops of parishes, or, to use modern language, dioceses. Such were the ecclesiastico-political arrangements of the universal Empire-Church of Jesus Christ, founded upon similar divisions in the former pagan empire of Rome.

Now, to say the least, these resemblances in the divisional arrangements of these two polities—the Roman empire and the Empire-Church—are most noteworthy. Were they accidental or were they designed? They cannot be accidental, because nothing, especially as concerns the Catholic Church, can occur without the permission of Almighty God. We are told that a sparrow does not fall to the ground "without our heavenly Father"; much less can it be supposed that the great Babylo-Roman Empire could have arisen and assumed such immense proportions by mere accident. The

* See Bingham's "Antiq. of the Christ. Ch.," Book ix.

idea is absurd, and is, moreover, contrary to the testimony of Holy Scripture. It follows, then, that this mighty empire had a mission to perform; for it grew up side by side with the ancient kingdom of God in Israel, and towards the period of the consummation of the Mosaic economy seized upon it and annexed it to its own dominion, to be in its own turn conquered by the New Empire of Christ, which should overthrow it, take possession of its capital and provinces, and assume its titles and dignities. That such was designed by Almighty God is evident from the great efforts made to destroy that invading Spiritual Power and to exterminate its subjects. The malevolence of Satan was specially directed against the *true* Pontifex Maximus, and hence we understand how it was that all the Popes from S. Peter to his Successor in A.D. 310, except four, were martyred.

Let us now ascertain whether there is anything in Holy Scripture to indicate that the substance of the Roman empire would be changed and converted into the substance of the Empire-Church of Christ, the territorial accidents, so to speak, of the old external regimen remaining in their integrity.

The ancient world-power consisted of Babylon proper, Medo-Persia, Macedonia, and of Rome, which was Babylon the second. These successive powers composed the Image or Figure which Nebuchadnezzar, King of Babylon, saw in vision. "Thou, O king," says Daniel, "sawest and behold a great Image. This great Image, whose bright-

ness was excellent, stood before thee; and the form thereof was terrible. This Image's head was of fine gold, his breast and his arms of silver, his belly and his thighs of brass, his legs of iron, his feet part of iron and part clay. Thou sawest till a Stone was cut out without hands, which smote the Image upon its feet that were of iron and clay, and brake them to pieces. Then was the iron, the clay, the brass, the silver, and the gold broken to pieces together, and became like the chaff of the summer threshing floors; and the wind carried them away, that no place was found for them, and the Stone that smote the Image became a mountain, and filled the whole earth."*

All ancient commentators agree that the four kingdoms symbolized by the gold, the silver, the brass, the iron and the clay, were Babylon proper, Medo-Persia, Macedonia, and Rome the second Babylon, which composed the Statue or Image presented in vision to Nebuchadnezzar, the King of Babylon.† Indeed, the language of Daniel interpreting the vision shows this clearly enough, for Nebuchadnezzar is described as "the Head of gold"; the empire which followed was Medo-Persia, whose king, Cyrus, figured in history as restorer of the holy city; and then Greece or Macedonia; and lastly, Rome, which was the last universal temporal Power. The head of the Image was the first to appear, the feet and legs came last, and they represented the Roman Dominion, the

* Dan. ii. 31–35.

† S. Iren. Adv. Hæres., l. v. c. xxvi.; S. Hieron. in Dan., c. ii.; S. Chrysost. in Dan., c. ii.

whole world system standing erect, having Rome for its foundation and base.

The Stone, we observe, struck the Image, not upon its head nor its body, nor upon its legs, *i. e.* the Roman dominion, but upon its feet, that is, the foundation and support and strength of the whole empire, even Rome. Then the whole structure—the head, the breast and arms, the belly and thighs, the legs and feet—fell to pieces, and the wind carried them away so effectually that "no place was found for them."

Babylo-Rome is the type, in an imperial and political sense, of the ecclesiastical greatness and glory of the Empire-Church of Christ. The symbols employed in the vision were likewise emblems of Christ, of the Holy Ghost, and of the Church.

The Head of gold is Christ our Lord, of whom Nebuchadnezzar was in this respect, *i. e.* as king of kings, the type. This prophet saw our Lord "clothed in linen, whose loins were girded with fine gold of Uphaz";* and in the Apocalypse, as "girt about the paps with a golden girdle."† The full description, however, is given in the Canticles: "His Head is as the most fine gold. . . . His hands are as gold rings set with the beryl. . . . His legs are as pillars of marble set upon sockets of fine gold."‡ The "gold," then, represents the glory of Christ, as the true "King of kings" and the true "Lord of lords." The silver seems emblematic of innocence and purity: "The words of the Lord are pure words: as silver tried in a

* Dan. x. 5. † Rev. i. 13. ‡ Cant. v. 11–16.

furnace of [fire, purged from the] earth, purified seven times."* "For Thou, O Lord, hast proved us; Thou hast tried us as silver is tried."† It also represents the beauty of true wisdom: "If thou seekest her as silver, and searchest for her as for hid treasures."‡ The following passage has certainly some very deep meaning: "We have a little sister, and she hath no breasts: what shall we do for our sister in the day when she shall be spoken for? If she be a wall, we will build upon her a palace of silver: and if she be a door, we will inclose her with boards of cedar."§ There is no doubt that this "little sister" is a type of immaculate purity, so excellent as to receive upon herself a "palace of silver." Do we not perceive the pure bride of Christ—the Church, under the symbol of the silver?

The brass is representative of strength: "He hath broken the gates of brass, and cut the bars of iron in sunder."‖ This passage is applied by Isaiah to Cyrus, who was the king of Persia and afterwards of Babylon, and who is declared to be the "Lord's Anointed."¶ He here typifies Christ and His Kingdom of brass, that is, the Empire-Church, as a great and invincible power, bearing sway "over all the earth," reducing all things to subjection to her authority.

The kingdom symbolized by the iron and the clay expresses overwhelming and crushing power and endurance, with an admixture of an element

* Ps. xii. 6. Comp. Ps. xi. Cath. Bible.
† *Ib.* lxvi. 10.
‡ Prov. ii. 4.
§ Cant. viii. 8, 9.
‖ Ps. cvii. 16.
¶ Isai. xlv. 1–2.

of weakness, which would ultimately rend the kingdom and dissolve it. The iron and the clay demonstrate (1) the irresistible power of the Empire-Church and its indefectibility, as is shown by Daniel in his interpretation, that the Kingdom which "the God of heaven shall set up shall never be destroyed . . . but it shall break in pieces and consume all these kingdoms, and it shall stand for ever":* and (2) the fragility of this same Empire-Church. This seems a paradox, but it is not really so, for the "clay" forms part—and indeed an essential part—of the Head and Body of the Catholic Church.

Christ took upon Himself our human nature, and was a man similar to ourselves, sin only excepted.† He took upon Himself, moreover, a mortal Body, because He intended to die at the time appointed. S. Paul has a remarkable passage on this point: "For though He was crucified through weakness, yet He liveth by the power of God."‡ He became weak for our sakes; He took on Him our "clay" and suffered division, for at His crucifixion His Soul was separated from His Body, to be reunited again for ever on the morning of the resurrection. The faithful, too, share in this weakness, for in the same passage it is said, "For we also are weak in Him, but we shall live with Him by the power of God toward you." We, too, shall be dissolved; for our souls and bodies will be rended asunder by death, to be reunited hereafter by the power of Jesus Christ.

The Church, too, in one sense, is "weak," for

* Dan. ii. 44. † Heb. iv. 15. ‡ 2 Cor. xiii. 4.

her members, individually or in groups, are fragile; hence many sin, hence many separate themselves from the one Church and form themselves into schismatic communions. But the Church differs from all other kingdoms in this matter, that she gains from her losses, she acquires strength from her weakness, and those portions of her body which abandon her seem but to increase her power. This is a paradox, but "unsearchable are His judgments, and His ways past finding out."* Certain it is that out of weakness is strength: "My grace is sufficient for thee," said our Lord to S. Paul, "for My strength is made perfect in weakness";† and in time of persecution we read that the faithful "out of weakness were made strong."‡ This is a peculiarity to the Empire-Church, viz. that out of the weakness and fragility of her members is she strong. But it is not so with secular empires, for weakness to them is ruin and desolation.

How beautifully, then, does the Image that Nebuchadnezzar saw in his vision typify and foreshow that great and august Empire that was to arise in the latter days in such glory and power. Its brightness and excellency foreshowed the luminous splendour of the Empire-Church of Jesus Christ: the fine gold, the glory of her Head; the silver, the immaculate purity and beauty of her Soul and Body; the fine brass, her amazing strength and irresistible might; and the iron mixed with clay, her invincibility, impregnability, and indefectibility, which not all the combined powers of

* Rom. xi. 33. † 2 Cor. xii. 9. ‡ Heb. xi. 34.

the world can for a moment corrupt, disintegrate, or dissolve, notwithstanding the admixture of clay, *i. e.* our human nature; for "out of weakness we are made strong."

Babylo-Rome, however, was not a mere symbol or type of the coming Empire; it was itself to be converted into the Empire-Church of Christ, the accidents, that is, if I may so speak, its outward form and polity, alone remaining. This was to be effected by a "Stone" and by "Wind." The Stone cut without hands out of the mountain of Sion is the symbol of Jesus Christ Incarnate, that is, God in the Flesh. We read in the Holy Scripture that the Corner-Stone of the Church is Christ, and that "whosoever shall fall on this Stone shall be broken: but on whomsoever it shall fall it will grind him to powder."

Now this Stone was destined to fall upon the feet of the Image of Nebuchadnezzar; and the effect of it—that is, upon Rome, the foundation and support of the old world-power—was to destroy the whole Image—that is to say, the Babylo-Roman empire; and so effectual was the destruction that "the Wind carried [it] away, and no place was found for" it. The Wind here seems to be the symbol of the Holy Ghost. We know what our Lord said: "The wind bloweth where it listeth, and thou hearest the sound thereof, but canst not tell whence it cometh, and whither it goeth: so is every one that is born of the Spirit."* Again, in the account immediately preceding the

* S. John iii. 8.

descent of the Holy Ghost, it is said there was "a sound from heaven as of a rushing mighty wind, and it filled all the house where they were sitting."* So when the Stone struck the feet of the Image, the Wind, that is, the Holy Ghost, came and annihilated the Babylo-Roman empire, converting its substance into the substance of the Empire-Church of Christ. This is clear from the circumstance that the Stone which fell did not return to the place from whence it came, but it remained, and grew into "a great mountain and filled the whole earth," that is to say, that it absorbed into itself the whole Babylo-Roman empire, and the entire world-power became thus the property of Jesus Christ.

But who or what was this Stone? I said just now that Jesus Christ was the Stone which struck the feet of the Image; and so it was; but how did He come, and in what manner? He did not come in *person*, as He did to Jerusalem; no, He came by delegation, under the form of another. But I shall enter on this subject in another part of my epistle. Suffice it now to assert that the effect of this Stone, which should strike Rome and remain there, was the same as that which is produced by leaven in a lump of dough, gradually changing it, absorbing into itself the very substance of the empire, converting it into itself; the only thing remaining were its terrestrial accidents, *i. e.* the outward appearances, *i. e.* again, its polity and autonomy adapted to Christian maxims. Behold! the Stone that fell

* Acts ii. 2.

in Rome, which grew into "a great mountain and filled the whole earth."*

But I must request you to consider certain prophetic symbols more particularly, showing how they are common both to the Babylo-Roman empire and the Empire of Jesus Christ. The first is the Lion and the Eagle. The Lion is the symbol of Babylon the first, of the world-power and of Satan himself; it is also the emblem of the ruling house of Judah, and of Jesus Christ, who is expressly called "the Lion of the Tribe of Judah."† The Eagle is the prophetic emblem of Babylon and Rome, the second Babylon; for the two are represented as united, the Lion having the wings of the Eagle. That the Eagle was the insignia of Rome needs no proof. The Lion and the Eagle find their places in the Gospel dispensation. Ezekiel saw "the likeness of four living creatures. And this was their appearance; they had the likeness of a man. And every one had four faces . . . as for the likeness of their faces, they four had the face of a man and the face of a lion, on the right side; and they four had the face of an ox on the left side; they four also had the face of an eagle."‡

These four symbols represent the Gospel of the Kingdom; the Incarnate Son—very Man—as the Lion of Judah, *i. e.* His Royalty; as the Ox of Sacrifice, *i. e.* His Priesthood; and the Eagle, that is His Divinity. These four symbols, too, are em-

* Dan. ii. 35. † Gen. xlix. 9; Rev. v. 5.
‡ Ezek. i. 5–11.

blematic of the Empire-Church of Christ, for it is the offspring of His Body in the supernatural order, and is called His Body, inheriting His Royalty, His Priesthood, and partaking of His Divinity; for, as S. Peter tells us, "we are partakers of His Divinity." These four living creatures represent Christ and His universal Empire-Church, and Ezekiel saw them go "every one straight forward; whither the Spirit was to go, they went; and they turned not when they went." We see these four living creatures described by S. John as standing before the Throne, together with the four-and-twenty elders, praising and adoring God. The Lion and the Eagle have their place in the Empire-Church of Christ.

Again, in the Babylo-Roman empire, as I observed above, the Lion and the Eagle were united to this extent, that the Lion of Babylon had Eagle's wings; so it was to be in the Empire-Church of Christ. Babylon, as the "head of gold," signified Christ the true "Head of gold," who is King of kings and Lord of lords. It represents also the Empire-Church, for Christ and the Church are one. The feet of iron and clay signify the universal city Rome. The Lion of Babylon and the Eagle of Rome symbolize first the Empire-Church, and secondly the city of Rome, which was destined for her earthly centre. As there was a junction between the Lion and Eagle of Babylon, so was there to be a union between the Lion of Christ and His Church with the Eagle of Rome.

It has pleased the Holy Ghost to foreshow the great invincible strength of the Roman empire by

means of the symbol of iron, and its weakness by that of clay. Clay represents mortality and weakness, iron massive power and strength. The invincibility, impregnability, and indefectibility of the Empire-Church are foreshown by iron, the clay, as I have shown above, having its place in the accidents of the empire, that is, all that is simply of earth. "Ask of Me and I will give thee the heathen for thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession. Thou shalt break them with a rod of iron; thou shalt break them in pieces like a potter's vessel." * "And she brought forth a Man-Child, who was to rule all nations with a rod of iron." † "And out of His mouth goeth a sharp sword, that with it He should smite the nations, and He shall rule them with a rod of iron: and He treadeth the wine-press of the fierceness and wrath of Almighty God." ‡

Thus is the Lion of the tribe of Judah armed with that terrible weapon the "Iron Rod," the scourge by which all unholy and rebellious princes and peoples shall be chastised if in their folly they resist the authority of the King of kings and Lord of lords. But this Iron Rod is also in the possession of the Empire-Church; for to the Catholic Church, as represented by the typical Church of Thyatira, the Spirit said: "He that overcometh, and keepeth My works unto the end, to him will I give power over the nations, and he shall rule them with a rod of iron; as the

* Ps. ii. 8, 9. † Rev. xii. 5. ‡ *Ib.* xix. 15.

vessels of a potter shall they be broken to shivers: even as I received of My Father, and I will give him the morning star." *

The identity of the Babylo-Roman empire with the Empire-Church of Christ, so far as the external polity is concerned, is complete; the gold, the silver, the brass, and the iron, and even the clay, all finding their places in the Empire of Christ, exhibiting the immortal splendour of the Holy City, her immaculate purity, her enormous strength, and her tremendous power internally and externally,—that is, her invincibility in war against "principalities and powers,"—her impregnability, in that she cannot be overcome, and her indefectibility, in that she can never be subject to decay or corruption. How powerfully does Daniel describe this in the crowning passage of this wonderful prophecy of the Statue and of the Stone: "And in the days of these kings shall the God of heaven set up a Kingdom, which shall never be destroyed: and the Kingdom shall not be left to other people, but it shall break in pieces and consume all these kingdoms, and it shall stand for ever"; † that is, they shall be consumed by "the Stone of Israel," itself taking their place and filling the whole earth: and this is further explained in another vision, "and the kingdom,"—the Babylo-Roman empire,—"and dominion, and the greatness of the kingdom under the whole heaven, shall be given to the people of the saints of the Most High, whose Kingdom is an ever-

* Rev. ii. 26–28. † Dan. ii. 44.

lasting kingdom, and all dominions shall serve and obey Him."*

It is most evident, then, that the Roman polity was from the beginning designed for the Empire-Church of Christ. We have seen how every department of the old political arrangements was seized upon and adapted to the new order of things, consequent upon the conquest of heathendom. We have seen how the city of Rome became the metropolis of Christendom; how the throne of the Cæsars passed into the possession of the Popes in the spiritual order; how the palace of the Emperor became the residence of the Pope; how the thirteen diœceses of the Roman empire formed the thirteen sees of the chief Prelates of the Empire-Church, the first three being known under the title of Patriarchs, and the remaining ten, of Exarchs; how the capitals of provinces passed into the ecclesiastical possession of the one hundred and twenty metropolitans of the primitive Church. We have also seen how the college of the Pontifex Maximus and the Pontifices were transformed into the sacerdotal college of the Supreme Pontiff and the Pontiffs of the Catholic Church; how the basilicas were converted into the halls of the crucified, and the temples of heathen Rome and her subject cities into the shrines of the saints and martyrs. And to demonstrate more emphatically that the empire of Rome was intended for the Empire of Christ, it was shown how the prophetic symbols of Rome pagan, of Christ, and of the Church, were

* Dan. vii. 27.

identical in kind and in signification; indicating with great clearness that the two great polities would at the proper time become united in one, that is, in the words of the Apocalypse, that "the kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our Lord, and of His Christ; and He shall reign for ever and ever."*

§ 4.

The Prophecies fulfilled.

Such were the divine intentions, viz. to form out of the substance of the Jewish race a great universal Empire, to be composed of all peoples, languages, and nations, to become, as S. Peter says, "a Holy Nation" and "a peculiar people," derived from the Seed of Abraham, through the Incarnate Son of God, and clothed with the imperial purple of the Roman empire in its external form and polity, having within it the swiftness of the Eagle and the royal strength of the Lion, the glory of the Gold, the splendour of the amber-coloured Brass, and the irresistible power of the Iron, wherewith to break in pieces and consume all the nations of the earth.

Let us now see how these prophecies were fulfilled. Our Lord first collected twelve men, whom He named Apostles. After a three and a half years' training He prepared them for the royal offices they were to fill, and during the forty days that intervened between His resurrection and ascension He

* Rev. xi. 15.

delivered to them the whole deposit of faith, and gave them instructions how to carry into effect His mighty design for the subjugation and conversion of the world. Having done this, He delivered to them the following commission: "Go ye into all the world, and preach the Gospel to every creature," and make disciples "of all nations, baptizing them in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost: teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and lo, I am with you all days, even till the consummation of the world. Amen." "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned."*

This is the Charter of the universal Empire-Church of Christ, delivered by our Lord to the Apostles, commanding them to put it forthwith into execution, that is, as soon as they should receive power from on high. Let us now examine the several points in this Charter of incorporation. First, He who issued it was the "Word of God," who is "God," even He who was "the Word made Flesh." Ages ago He made this and other worlds, and peopled them. The original creatures in some way connected with this globe rebelled against Him, and He destroyed the world, reducing it to chaos. He re-created it, and placed in it a new race, formed after the Similitude of God.

The primary duty of Adam was to "multiply and replenish the earth, and subdue it; and have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl

* S. Matt. xxviii. 19, 20; S. Mark xvi. 15, 16.

of the air, and over every living thing that moveth upon the earth." Adam was appointed absolute Lord of the whole earth. But he failed, breaking the commandment of God, and reducing the whole world to a moral chaos. Christ—the second Adam—came to restore all things. To effect this He first redeemed the world, appeased the just indignation of the Father, and, by the shedding of His Blood, He merited for us an eternal inheritance. Christ by that act, in His capacity as Man,—as the second Adam,—became by right the Lord and Master of the whole earth. In a word, He assumed the position of Adam before his fall, and the duties involved in that position. He was to "be fruitful and multiply, and replenish the earth, and subdue it." This He was to effect by means of His Church, which, as His Bride, should bring forth children to Him through the laver of regeneration, that is, by the mixture of the "Spirit and the water and the Blood" in the Sacrament of Baptism. The position of our Lord, then, was as absolute Master of this world. Secondly, as its Sovereign Lord, He gave the world to S. Peter and the Apostles: "I appoint unto you a Kingdom, as My Father hath appointed unto Me."* As the Father delivered unto Christ the Kingdom, so Christ, in His turn, being about to leave the earth, conveyed it to S. Peter and the Apostles. By that act the world became the property of the Twelve, who were to reign over it as spiritual kings and priests unto God and His Christ.

* S. Luke xxii. 29.

Thirdly, the Apostles were directed to "go into all the world," into every part of it, and in the Name of Jesus Christ to take possession of it. Fourthly, they were commanded to preach the Gospel of Jesus Christ to "every creature,"—not one race in particular, not to one caste only, but to every one, high and low, rich and poor, king and subject, to make known to them that Gospel of salvation which they received from the Lord. Fifthly, the Apostles were ordered to "make disciples of all nations," that is, to enrol them in the registry of the Empire-Church of Christ as His subjects, whom they were to rule in His Name and on His behalf. Sixthly, they were directed to teach them to observe all things whatsoever He had commanded them to teach; not this or that opinion, not this or that form of Church government, not this or that denomination, not this or that doctrine, but everything, without any exception whatever, which Christ had delivered to them. Seventhly, those admonitions were accompanied with both a benediction and a curse, which should be pondered over by men in general, more than is customary for them to do. "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned." According to this, two things are absolutely required from all men, viz. faith and obedience. Faith without obedience is of no effect; "the devils," says S. James, "believe, and tremble."* "Faith without works is dead,"† added the same Apostle. Faith by itself, without con-

* S. James ii. 19. † *Ib.* 26.

formity to the divine rule in every particular respect, will not avail us. To be saved, there must be a thorough and unreserved submission to the laws and ordinances of Christ, as delivered to the Apostles and handed down in the Church; otherwise no salvation can be had. "He that believeth not," that is, everything I have commanded to be observed, everything I have directed to be taught, "shall be damned." And lastly, to demonstrate the perpetuity of this divine Charter, and also to provide for the entirety of its being carried out to the very letter, Christ added, "Lo, I am with you all days, even till the consummation of the world," that is, until the Second Advent, when He shall come to judge the world, to destroy the world-power always at enmity with Him, and Satan, the arch-enemy of God and of all creation.

Such is the universal Empire-Church of Christ, ages before foretold by prophets, of which the Jewish nation would be the cradle, and the Roman empire its outward form and polity, which, under the metaphor of a Stone cut without hands, should first destroy, and then assume its place, reducing the whole earth to the dominion of Christ, ruling it with the sceptre of righteousness, and punishing all its enemies with that terrible "Rod of iron" with which she is armed by her divine Lord. In obedience to the divine command, we read that the Apostles spread themselves over all the then known world. S. Peter, after remaining a few years in Jerusalem, travelled to Antioch, and ultimately to Rome, who, "as a noble general of God, armed with heavenly weapons, brought the

precious merchandise of intellectual light from the East to the far West."* S. Paul travelled over the greater part of the Roman world. S. John settled in Asia Minor, S. Thomas in India, and S. Mark, the disciple of S. Peter, in Egypt. As the Apostles fell one by one under the sword of the heathen, others succeeded to their episcopal sees and carried on the war against the stronghold of Satan, our Lord "working with them," as He promised to do when He said, "Lo, I am with you all days, even till the consummation"; and so will it continue till the time shall arrive, when it can be truly said, the "kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our Lord and of His Christ; and He shall reign for ever and ever," "King of kings and Lord of lords."†

It is clear, then, that the establishment of a great universal Empire-Church was designed by God from the very beginning, and that such design was carried into effect, according to the prophecies, out of the substance of the Jewish race, its outward form and polity being provided by the Providence of God from the autonomy of the Babylo-Roman Empire.

§ 5.

The Testimony of the Holy Fathers.

The following extracts from the writings of the Holy Fathers demonstrate the truth of the universality of the Kingdom and Church of Christ:—

* Euseb. H. E., l. ii. c. 14. † Rev. xi. 15, xvii. 14.

S. Ignatius, A.D. 107.

"See that you follow the bishop, even as Jesus Christ does the Father, and the priesthood as ye would the Apostles; and reverence the deacons, as being the institution of God. . . . Let that be deemed a canonical Eucharist which is celebrated either by the bishop, or by one who has been commissioned by [the bishop]. Wherever the bishop is, there let the multitude of [the faithful] be; even as, wherever Jesus Christ is, there is the Catholic [*i. e.* universal] Church."*

"For even Jesus Christ, our inseparable life, is the [expression of the] Will of the Father; as also are the bishops, placed everywhere, to the utmost bounds [of the earth], are so by the will of Jesus Christ."†

The bishop—*i. e.* the canonical bishop, lawfully elected and confirmed in his see—is the representative of Jesus Christ to that portion of the Flock over which he has been appointed pastor, and all must follow him, and no other. The bishops, the representatives of Christ, and the chiefs of the Empire-Church of Christ, are stationed in every place throughout the wide expanse of the world, all united, one with the other, in one faith, and in one communion and fellowship. This is the universal Empire-Church of Christ.

S. Justin Martyr, A.D. 139.

"Accordingly, God anticipating all the sacrifices which we offer through this Name, and which Jesus the Christ enjoined us to offer, that is, the Eucharist of the bread and the cup, and which are presented by Christians in every place throughout the world, bear witness that they are well-pleasing to Him. . . . For first of all, not even does your nation [Judea] extend to the rising and setting of the sun, but there are nations, in which none of your

---

* Ep. ad Smyrn., c. viii. † Ep. ad Ephes., c. iii.

race [the Jews] ever dwelt. For there is not one single race of men, whether barbarians or Greeks, or whatever they may be called—nomads, or vagrants, or herdsmen living in truth—among whom prayers and Eucharists are not offered through the Name of the crucified Jesus." *

S. Justin draws his argument in favour of Christianity, as against the position of the Jews, from the prophecy of Malachi, that "from the rising of the sun even unto the going down of the same My Name shall be great among the Gentiles; and in every place incense shall be offered unto My Name, and a pure offering: for My Name shall be great among the heathen, saith the Lord of Hosts." † He shows how impossible it was for the Jewish nation to fulfil this prophecy, for that nation was limited, in respect to its boundaries, to one spot on the earth; whereas, to meet the scope of the prediction, the whole area of the world would be requisite. Contrasting the two peoples, the Jews and the Christians, he showed how the latter are to be found in every place, among every class and caste among men, barbarians, Greeks, wanderers, shepherds, &c.; where prayers and the great sacrifice of the Eucharist—the oblation of the Catholic Church—are continually offered. "In all places throughout the world," and among every race of men, is the Empire-Church of Christ established.

S. Irenæus, A.D. 178.

"The Church, though dispersed throughout the whole world, even to the ends of the earth, has received from the Apostles and

* Dial. cum Tryphone, n. 117. † Mal. i. 11.

their disciples this faith [I believe] in one God, &c. As I have already observed, the Church, having received this preaching and this faith, although spread throughout the whole world, yet, as if occupying but one House, carefully preserves it."*

"Whereupon the Lord God did even give it [the vineyard], no longer hedged round, but opened unto the whole world, to other husbandmen, rendering the fruits in their season, the beautiful elect tower being also exalted everywhere. For the illustrious Church is everywhere, and everywhere is the winepress digged; because those who receive the Spirit are everywhere. For inasmuch as the former have rejected the Son of God, and cast Him out of the vineyard when they slew Him, God has justly rejected them, and given to the Gentiles outside the vineyard the fruits of its husbandry."†

The vineyard was at first hedged all round, that is, the Church under the law, circumscribed as to place, its tower situated in one locality; but the Jews having rejected and slain Jesus, the hedge was torn down and all the world admitted within the fold, the tower being as universal as the globe. The Empire-Church is then everywhere, in every place "throughout the whole world, even to the ends of the earth."

S. Clement of Alexandria, A.D. 190.

"The philosophers satisfied only their peculiar followers; but the Word of our Teacher was not confined to Judea, as philosophy was to Greece, but was diffused over the whole inhabited earth; convincing nations and villages, and whole cities, and households, and individual hearers, both amongst Greeks and barbarians, and bringing not a few of the philosophers themselves under the [yoke] of the truth."‡

---

* Adv. Hæres., l. i. c. x. n. 1, 2.

† *Ib.* l. iv. c. xxxvi. n. 2.

‡ Strom., l. vi. p. 827. Venet. 1757.

The philosophy of the Christian religion did not concern merely a particular people, nor was the teaching of the doctrine of Christ confined to a single race, but all men of every nation are included in that universal school, the Empire-Church of Christ.

Tertullian, A.D. 195.

"If we desired indeed to act the part of open enemies, not merely of secret avengers, would there be any lacking in strength, whether of numbers or resources? The Moors, the Marcomans, the Parthians themselves, or any other people, however great, inhabiting a distinct territory and confined within its own boundaries, surpass, forsooth, in numbers one spread over the whole world! We are of yesterday, but we have filled every place among you,—cities, islands, fortresses, towns, assemblies, your very camp, your tribes, companies, palace, senate, forum—we have left nothing to you but the temples of your gods. . . . For if such multitudes of men were to break away from you and betake themselves to some other remote corner of the world, why, the very loss of so many citizens, of whatever sort they were, would cover your kingdom with shame; nay, in the very forsaking, vengeance would be inflicted. Why, you would tremble at the solitude in which you would find yourselves, at the silence of everything, at the death-like stupor of the whole world; you would have more enemies than citizens remaining. For now it is the immense number of Christians which makes your enemies so few, almost all the inhabitants of your various cities being followers of Christ."*

"Come, now, thou that wilt exercise thy curiosity to better purpose in the business of thy salvation, run over the Apostolic Churches, in which the very chairs of the Apostles to this very day preside over their own places. . . . Is Achaia near to thee? Thou hast Corinth. If thou art not far from Macedonia, thou hast Philippi, thou hast the Thessalonians. If thou canst travel into Asia, thou hast Ephesus. But if thou art near to Italy, thou

---

* Apol., n. 37.

hast Rome, whence we also have an authority at hand. That Church, how happy! on which the Apostles poured out all their doctrine with their blood," &c.*

Everywhere was the Church established, after the Apostolic form, in Europe, in Asia, and in Africa, all being one compact polity, governed and administered by the bishops of every city, who form that one undivided Brotherhood which heretics have striven to tear asunder, but cannot.

Origen, A.D. 216.

"And who . . . can help being filled with wonder when he sees that, according to His words, the Gospel of Jesus Christ has been preached to all upon earth, both to Greeks and barbarians, to the wise and to the foolish? For the word spoken with power has vanquished the whole nature of man, and there is not a race of men to be seen that has refused to receive the doctrine of Jesus."†

"Indeed, this earthly region is called the land of Sion, but Christ and His Church is Lord and Master of all the world, and [it is called also] Sion."‡

The Kingdom and Church of God under the law was called Sion; this was typical of the true Kingdom and Church that was hereafter to be formed, which would also be "Sion," its dominion not being confined to the land of Israel, but would include within its borders the whole world. God was the Master of the figurative Israel; but Christ, and not Christ only, but His Church also, Lord and Master of every part of this globe in which we live.

* De Præscript. Hæres., n. 36.
† T. i. contra Cels., l. ii. n. 13.
‡ T. ii. Hom. xiii. Numb. n. 1.

S. Cyprian, A.D. 248.

Many passages from S. Cyprian's writings I have to quote as I proceed, and therefore I shall content myself here with one extract.

"The episcopate is one, a compact part of which is held by each bishop. The Church, too, is one, though extended far and wide, and is further multiplied by the increase of her fruitfulness. As the sun has many rays, yet one light, . . . part a ray of the sun from its orb, this division of light the unity allows not. . . . Thus the Church, flooded with the light of the Lord, puts forth her rays throughout the whole earth," &c.*

The episcopate is one body, extending over all the earth, "a compact part of which is held by each bishop," not separately from his brethren, but one with them and subject to them, according to the laws of the Church; for, "part a ray from the sun," the fountain of light, "this division of light the unity allows not." This light shining through the various "orbs" that are placed in the ecclesiastical firmament, that is "the stars," that is, again, the bishops of the Churches, enlighten the whole world, and the Church, "stretching her branches over the universal earth," waters the whole of it with the river of life. The Church is therefore a universal body, and episcopal in its form, not as represented by each bishop independently of his brethren, but represented by him in union and in subjection to the whole.

* De Unitate, p. 195. Paris, 1726.

Eusebius, A.D. 325.

"Thus assuredly, by the power and assistance of Heaven, did the saving word, like a ray of the sun, at once enlighten the whole world; and immediately, according to the divine Scripture, the 'sound' of the divine Evangelists and Apostles 'went forth over the whole earth, and their words unto the end of the world.' And throughout all cities and villages, like a well-filled granary, most numerous and crowded churches were at once assembled."*

"In the place of that great and proud city that has been destroyed, he prophesies that another City was to be built unto God, the Catholic Church reaching from one end of the earth to the other."†

When Christ, the "ray" from heaven, came, He sent His Apostles and Evangelists to every part of the world, and all "cities and villages" became subject to the Empire-Church; and in the place of that proud and haughty city, Jerusalem of old, a new City has been built, whose boundaries are conterminous with the confines of the earth.

S. Cyril of Jerusalem, A.D. 363.

"Now it is called Catholic, because it is throughout the whole world, from one end of the earth to the other; and because it teaches universally and completely all the doctrine which ought to come to men's knowledge concerning things both visible and invisible, heavenly and earthly; and because it subjugates unto godliness the whole race of men, both governors and governed, learned and unlearned; and because it universally treats and heals every sort of sin committed by soul and body, and possesses in itself every form of virtue which is named, both in deeds and words, and every kind of spiritual gift.‡ . . . And while the

---

* H. E., l. ii. c. 3.

† Comment. in Hesai, c. 32. Nova Collect. Pat. Græc. Montf., t. ii. p. 484.

‡ Catech. xviii. n. 23.

kings of particular nations have bounds set to their dominions, the Holy Catholic Church alone has an illimitable authority over the whole world."*

Here we have a noble statement of the universal sovereignty of that Empire-Church which Christ established upon earth, universal in authority, having no boundaries or limits like ordinary earthly kingdoms, but spread over all the world, teaching "universally and completely" every doctrine which men ought to know, subduing "the whole race of men," both emperors, kings, princes, and their subjects, to that universal law of faith and morals which it universally enforces everywhere.

The above passage is exhaustive, it speaks for itself; it really needs no comment.

S. Optatus of Milevis, A.D. 368.

"Allow the Son to possess what has been given Him; allow the Father to fulfil His promises. Why put you up boundaries? Why fix limits? Since, on the part of God the Father, the whole earth was promised to the Saviour, there is not one thing in any part of the earth which seems excepted from His possession. The whole earth, with its inhabitants, has been given; the whole earth is to Christ one possession. This is proved by God, who says, 'I will give Thee the nations for Thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for Thy possession.' And in the 71st Psalm, thus it is written of the same Saviour, 'He shall rule from sea to sea, and from the rivers unto the ends of the earth.' The Father, in giving, makes no exception; you give an ounce and try to take away the whole pound. And you still strive to persuade men that with you only is the Church; robbing Christ of what He has merited; denying Him what the Father

* Catech. xviii. n. 27.

has granted. Oh! the ungrateful and foolish presumption of your party! Christ invites you, with the rest of men, unto the fellowship of the heavenly kingdom, and exhorts you to be joint heirs; and you try to defraud Him of the inheritance granted Him by the Father, by giving Him a part of Africa, and refusing Him the whole world bestowed upon Him by the Father. . . . We have therefore proved that that is the Catholic Church which is spread over the whole earth."*

This eminent Father points out clearly and distinctly that the dominion of the Empire-Church of Christ is not restricted to one or two provinces or nations, but to the whole world. He shows that nothing is excepted from this dominion, but every part of the earth, together with all its inhabitants, kings and subjects, rich and poor, belong to Christ. "The whole earth is to Christ one possession," that is, one Empire, of which He, so to speak, is the Emperor, for He is King of kings and Lord of lords. There is a point in this extract which is of vital importance: that the Church cannot be limited to Africa, or indeed to any locality; for to denounce, as the Donatists did, the whole Church as corrupt, and to say that "with us only is the Church," is "to rob Christ of what He has merited," "denying Him what the Father has granted." The Father did not bestow upon Him a part, but the whole earth; and therefore all the world is His property, and, let me add, the property also of His Church; for what has He established upon earth but His universal Empire-Church, extending from "sea to sea, and from the rivers unto the ends of the earth"? and

* De Schism. Donat., l. ii. n. 1, 2.

therefore for a spot on the earth to ignore the world-wide Empire-Church is "a most ungrateful and foolish presumption," little short of blasphemous folly, as well as the most stupid impiety, the result of diabolical pride and arrogance. Where, then, is the Empire-Church of Christ? S. Optatus tells us plainly "that it is the Catholic Church, which is spread over the whole earth," and, as we shall see hereafter, that it is known and identified by one special mark, the "Chair of Peter at Rome."

S. Pacian, A.D. 372.

"'But under the Apostles,' you say, 'no one was called a Catholic.' Grant this to have been the fact; or suppose it to have been so. When heresies arose after the Apostles' days, and, under divers names, strove to tear and scatter piecemeal the 'dove' of God and His 'queen,' did not the apostolic people require a peculiar name whereby to distinguish the unity of the people that had not been corrupted, for fear lest the error of a few might tear limb by limb the 'unstained' virgin of God? Was it not beseeming that the Principal Head should be designated by a suitable title? Suppose I entered, this very day, into a populous city, and found there Marcionites, Apollinarians, Cataphrygians, Novatians, and others of the same sort, all calling themselves Christians: by what name should I be able to recognize the congregation of my own people, were it not for its being called Catholic? . . . And yet, my brother, fret not yourself; Christian is my name, but Catholic my surname. That names me, this describes me; by this I am approved, by that I am designated. And if at last we must give an account of the word Catholic, and express it from the Greek, by a Latin interpretation, 'Catholic' is 'everywhere one,' or, as the more learned think, 'obedience in all.' . . . Therefore he who is a Catholic, the same is obedient to what is right. He who is obedient, the same is a Christian; and thus the Catholic is a Christian. Wherefore

our people, when named Catholic, are separated by this appellation from the heretical name. But if also the word Catholic means 'everywhere one,' as those first think, David indicates this very thing when he says, 'The queen stood in gilded clothing, surrounded with variety,' that is, one amidst all. . . . Amidst all she is one, and one over all."*

The above passage is remarkable as showing the true contrast between the name Catholic, by which the whole Church is known and identified, and other bodies separated from her, which are discerned by their respective designations. At first, the Church was only known by the appellation "Church," and her people by the name "Christian." But as heresies increased, and sects became abundant, all claiming for themselves the word "Church" and "Christian," so the necessity grew for employing a designation by which the universal Church, spread throughout the whole world, should be distinguished from the schismatics. This designation, indeed, is one which is expressed by *universality*, that is, universality descriptive of that one Body, teaching everywhere the same faith, claiming and exercising authority and jurisdiction everywhere. The Greek word "Catholic" became the fitting name of that great and universal communion. In after-ages, when certain heretics claimed the name "Catholic," then the meaning of this word had to be more exactly defined, and hence the term "Roman" was added, to denote the whole Church in communion with the Holy See. This Father seems to indicate this truth when he asks the question, "Was it not beseeming

* Ep. i. n. 2–4; Galland., t. vii. p. 257–8.

that the Principal Head should be designated by a suitable title?" From the above, then, we observe that the Church of Christ is not local, but universal, every baptized member thereof having for his name "Christian," and for his surname "Catholic," by which he is identified with that one Body which exists everywhere, the alone "Dove of God," the "Queen" that reigns as mistress of the world.

S. Epiphanius, A.D. 385.

"These men dwell in a confined tract [of country] in Phrygia, Cilicia, and Pamphylia. What, then, is the Church cut off, which is extended from one extremity of the earth to the other? And 'has not their sound gone forth into all the earth, and their words to the ends of the world'? And was it not said by the Saviour, 'Ye shall be witnesses unto Me, even to the uttermost parts of the earth'?"*

This Father repeats over and over again the question, How can a part claim to be the whole? how can the whole be contained in the part? Or, to put it more tersely, how can the lands of Phrygia, Cilicia, or Pamphylia, each contain within itself the whole Empire-Church of Christ? Universality is opposed to Locality; the two are contrary, one to the other. The Empire-Church established is a universal one, not local; it dwells in places, and possesses chief cities and a capital,—its seat of government,—but it is not circumscribed as to space, nor is it limited to a single people or to any special race. That which is *local* is a sect or

* T. i. Adv. Hæres. (61), l. ii. vol. i. n. 2.

a schismatical body; that which is universal, extending everywhere, is the truth; and therefore that Empire-Church which is universal is a proof, *ipso facto*, of its authority and truthfulness. Hence we see, from the method of argument of this Father, how that which Christ instituted was universal, and not local, like the Phrygians, the Cilicians, and the Pamphylians.

S. Ambrose, A.D. 385.

"What more plain than that in this place [Gen. xlvi. 2] they [the Jews] are invited to pass over to the Holy Church of God, and they, who had hitherto been confined within the narrow boundaries of Judea, to come to the people of God, which, assembled out of the whole world, out of all nations and peoples, is made into a great nation. 'Their sound,' in fine, has gone forth into the whole world."*

S. Jerome, A.D. 390.

"It is manifest that this [passage, viz. 'my Redeemer, the Holy One of Israel, shall be called the God of all the earth'] is not said of Jerusalem, which never ruled over the whole world; but that it relates to the Church of Christ, whose inheritance is the possession of the world."†

These two passages from SS. Ambrose and Jerome together state the full truth, viz. that the Empire-Church of Christ was not a local one, but universal; not "confined within the narrow boundaries of Judea," not limited to "Jerusalem, which never ruled over all the world," but "to the people of God, which, assembled out of the whole world, out

* T. i. De Joseph., c. xiv. n. 82.
† T. iv. in Isai. l. xv. c. liv.

of all nations and peoples, is made into a great nation," that is, into one great Empire, including within itself every nation.

S. Augustine, A.D. 400.

"For the Lord promised, and that with an oath, to the 'seed of Abraham,' not the Romans only, but all nations; through which promise has it already happened that some nations, that are not under the Roman yoke, have received the Gospel, and been united to the Church, which fructifies and increases throughout the whole world. But there is room for her increase, until that be accomplished, which, under the figure of Solomon, was foretold of Christ: 'He shall rule from sea to sea, and from the river unto the ends of the earth.' From the 'river,' to wit, where He was baptized, because from that time He began to preach the Gospel; while from 'sea to sea' is the whole world with all its nations, because the world is belted round by the ocean. How otherwise, shall that prophecy be fulfilled; 'All nations which Thou hast made, shall come and worship before Thee, O Lord'? For, not by migrating from their own lands 'shall they come,' but by believing in their own lands. . . . But the prophet says, 'and they shall adore Him, every man from his own place, all the islands of the Gentiles.' 'All the islands,' he says, as though he should say, 'even' all the islands, thereby showing that there shall truly be no part of the world left where the Church is not, when not even an island is left without one."*

"Consider, I pray you, under what folly the heretics are labouring. They, cut off from union with the Church of Christ, holding a part, and letting go the whole, will not communicate with the whole world, over which the glory of Christ is spread. But we Catholics are in every nation, because we communicate with every land wherein the glory of Christ is spread."†

"A heretic comes forward and says, 'I have people in Africa'; and another from some other quarter says, 'And I have people in

---

* T. ii. Class iii. Epist. Ep. cxcix. Hesychio, de fine sæc. n. 47.

† T. iv. Enarr. in Ps. lvi. n. 13.

Galatia.' Thou hast them in Africa; he has them in Galatia: I seek for a man that has them everywhere. True, because you heard, 'Let people confess to Thee, O God'; you dared to exult at the words: learn from the verse that follows, that he speaks not of a part: 'Let all people confess to Thee.' Walk in the way with all nations; walk in the way with all peoples; ye children of peace, ye children of the alone Catholic Church, walk in this way, and as you walk, sing."*

It is one of the glories of S. Augustine that his exegesis on every subject is exhaustive. In the extracts above given we see how he regards the universal Empire-Church of Christ. He shows clearly that the Gospel began to be proclaimed by our Lord from the moment He was baptized in the "river," which began to spread everywhere, until the prophecy was fulfilled that Christ "shall rule from sea to sea, and from the river unto the end of the earth," and that "all nations shall come and worship before" Him, not by "migrating from their own lands," but "by believing in their own lands." And when he so argued, he did not mean that men were to believe and adore individually, or separately from the remainder of the faithful, but as one people, known under the name of "Catholic," that is, as he interprets, "Children of the alone Catholic Church"; that is, again, not many Catholic Churches, not an independent Catholic Church here, and another there, and another somewhere else, but that which is the "alone," or rather the one sole body which is called the Catholic Church. It was the

* T. iv. Enarr. in Ps. lxvi. n. 6.

policy of old, as it is still, to speak of a particular people or sect as the Catholic Church, some saying, "I have people in Africa," and "I have people in Galatia"; but what answer does this renowned Father give to this foolish and impious rhodomontade? "I ask for a man that has them everywhere," that is, one who owns communion with all peoples and nations, united in that one communion and fellowship, and subject to that alone and exclusive "Catholic" Church.

S. Cyril of Alexandria, A.D. 424.

"'Enlarge the place of thy tent,'* &c." "For in its beginnings the Church of Christ was straitened, later it is spread from east to west, and from north to south, and has reached every place."†

This passage reminds me of the prophecy of our Lord to Jacob, delivered upon the top of the Ladder, when He said: "And thy seed shall be as the dust of the earth, and thou shalt spread abroad to the west and to the east, and to the north and to the south, and in thee and in thy seed shall all the families of the earth be blessed."‡

The Seed of Abraham, of Isaac and of Jacob, was to spread all over the earth, and to be so numerous as to be as impossible to enumerate as to count the particles of dust upon the ground, or the myriads of stars that adorn the heavens above. All the baptized are of the Seed of Abraham, through

* Isai. liv. 2.

† T. i. de Ador. in Sp. et Ver., l. ix. p. 319.

‡ Gen. xxviii. 14.

and by Jesus Christ our Incarnate Lord, of whose Body, Flesh, and Bones we are really, truly, and substantially "members"; and that by no carnal law, but by that sacramental law by which we are "born again of water and of the Spirit."

Theodoret, A.D. 424.

"One indeed is the Church throughout all earth and sea; for which cause when we pray, we say, 'For the holy and alone Catholic and Apostolic Church, which is from one end of the earth to the other.' That same City, again, is divided into cities, and towns, and villages, which the prophetic word denominates 'houses.' As every city has in it many separate houses, and is nevertheless called one city, so are there tens of thousands and countless Churches, both on the islands and continents, but they are all perfected together into one Church, united together by the concord of sound doctrine."*

What was the name of that great empire that once ruled over all the earth? It was denominated Rome, after the name of the Capital. There were only two great empires in antiquity that were known by the name of their chief city—Babylon and Rome. No other empire or kingdom in ancient or modern history was ever described by the title of its capital city. In ancient times we read of the Assyrian, Medo-Persian, and Macedonian empires; and at this day, of the British, the French, the German, and the Austrian empires; but never the empire of London, Paris, Frankfort, or Vienna. This is a peculiarity of those empires which were formed in the Providence of God for the ultimate

* T. i. in Ps. xlvii.

advantage of the Church. The Babylo-Roman empire was intended for the external polity of the Empire-Church of Christ, and hence we observe a similarity in the form of nomenclature. Rome signified not merely the city, but the whole empire, inclusive of Gaul, Britain, Spain, Greece, Egypt, Asia Minor, and South Germany, which together formed one political body, known by the appellation of the Roman empire. In fact, the whole constituted one city, even Rome. The Empire-Church of Christ is like Rome of old—one City, within which the whole earth is included; the various cities and villages situated north, south, east, and west are suburbs of greater or lesser importance, all of which are subject to that one City, the city of Rome Christian, wherein is that Stone, implanted there by God Himself, which has "grown into a great mountain filling the whole earth." This, then, is in exact accordance with the testimony of Theodoret. It is sufficient to quote a passage from his letter to Renatus, in which he writes, that "that most holy Throne [of the Holy See of Rome] has the Sovereignty over the Churches throughout the universe."*

It is plain, then, that the Fathers of the primitive ages taught that the holy Catholic Church, that is, the Empire-Church of Christ, was a universal and not a local institution, comprehending within its embrace not one people, but all peoples;

* T. iv. Ep. cxvi. ad Renat.

not one nation, but all nations; not one language, but all languages. And this not as separate polities, each enjoying a sort of independence as each kingdom in the family of nations, but one polity, every part being subject to the whole, and the whole subject to that authority which Christ has created for the government of the whole.

CHAPTER III.

THE CHURCH A VISIBLE POLITY.

No doubt much that has been advanced in the preceding chapter will be admitted, but there still remains the question, Is the Empire-Church of Christ a visible or an invisible body? Is its Empire over souls only, exclusive of the body, or are both body and soul subject to it? This is a question of primary importance, and before proceeding it is necessary it should be determined.

The first question we should ask ourselves is, What is Man? What are the properties which compose the creature we call Man? Is that which we call man, speaking with exactitude, simply a spirit, of which the body is nothing more than an outward form or tenement, to be dissolved for ever by death? Regarding this subject there are two classes of heretics, one believing that the soul or spirit passes to immortality after the death of the body, to continue for ever a pure ethereal spirit, without any material form whatever; the other, that man is nothing different from the brute creation, except in his intelligence, and that, like the animals, he dies at the end of his term of life and never rises again. Both these opinions are damnable heresies, contrary to the teaching of the Bible and

the Church, and opposed, too, to that deep consciousness which every man, even the savage, possesses, viz. that in some form or other, he will live for ever.

What, then, is man? Man is a complex being, partly spirit and partly matter; that is to say, having a body formed according to the law of procreation, with a spirit created by God, and infused into the human body as soon as it has taken the shape and form of man. "And the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul."* "Then shall the dust return to the earth as it was: and the spirit shall return to God who gave it."†

But what is the distinction between the spirit of a man and the spirit of a beast? "All go into one place; all are of the dust, and all turn to dust again. Who knoweth the spirit of man that goeth upward, and the spirit of the beast that goeth downward to the earth."‡ The spirit, then, of man is an immortal substance; and when "the dust" has "turned to dust again," departs "upwards," *i. e.* to Him who gave it. The body indeed dies, because of sin, but it rises again, and the two parts of man reunite themselves, to live together for ever, either in heaven or hell, and these two parts form the essential elements of that creature we denominate man. No one can read S. Paul's exposition of the doctrine of the resurrection without perceiving that

* Gen. ii. 7. † Eccl. xii. 7. ‡ *Ib.* iii. 20–21.

the resurrection of the body is a cardinal doctrine of revelation.

After reciting the resurrection of Christ from the dead, he puts two questions: "Now if Christ be preached that He rose from the dead, how say some among you that there is no resurrection from the dead?" *i.e.* of the body, for the soul or spirit of a man never dies, and cannot die; for he adds, "If there be no resurrection of the dead, then is Christ not risen: and if Christ be not risen [from the dead], then is our preaching vain, and your faith is also vain."* The existence of the soul or immortal spirit in a man is a fact of revelation, and the resurrection of the body after death is another fact of revelation—a fact so certain, that if there were even a doubt respecting it, the whole structure of Christianity would necessarily crumble to pieces, for, as S. Paul argues, if there is no resurrection of the dead, then Christ is not risen; and conversely, "if Christ be not risen," then our "faith is vain, and we are yet in our sins." Grant the resurrection of Christ from the dead, then the resurrection of the body is a necessary corollary, for the two stand or fall together. Man, then, being composed of two things, a Soul and a Body, the former being immortal, and the latter, after the resurrection, likewise immortal, they are each a subject for the operation of grace, in order that they may be saved, and therefore ordinances suited to both are necessary.

Now the body of a man is a visible substance, it

* 1 Cor. xv. 12–14.

possesses a variety of senses, the wilful misuse of any one of which, unless repented of, is fatal to its ultimate salvation, and that of the soul. These senses are not peculiar to the body, but to the soul likewise, for the body is the tenement and organ of the soul; by it, it manifests and executes its will. Nor are they limited in their thought and actions to earth. Both the body and soul see objects on earth, and by faith, objects in heaven. And hereafter they shall see the beatific vision, if worthy of salvation. They both taste of things of earth and of heaven, even in this life; they both hear sounds, coming from earth and from heaven; the "still small voice" is ever present in their minds, and they have the faculty of hearing the voice of the Holy Spirit through those channels which He has appointed. They both touch things of earth and of heaven, and their sense of smell is gratified by perfumes of things in this world and in the next.

I say even in this life the five senses have their part in things of earth and of heaven: the one materially, according to the order of nature; the other supernaturally, according to the order of grace; but in the next world the senses will exist in their absolute perfection. For there the redeemed will ever be hearing and taking part in the everlasting Alleluias of the blessed; feasting their eyes for ever on the Lamb, slain from the foundation of the world: there their sense of touch will be intensified to the utmost degree, when they will be permitted to handle the Son of Man; there they will ever be tasting of the supper of the Lamb, and

ever smelling the sweet odour that continually arises in clouds of smoke in honour of God and the Redeemer of the world.

Man, then, is a material and visible creature, and such he will be for ever. The Empire-Church of Christ, instituted as it was for the salvation, not of souls only, but of men (*i. e.* soul and body), must of necessity be commensurate with the whole extent of man's nature. It must be composed of matter, no less than spirit; it must be a palpable reality, no less than an intangible one: in a word, it must be a visible Polity, no less than an invisible one. The Church is called the Bride of Christ, it must then be like Him; it must possess a body of earth, no less than a soul from heaven; and these two—the Body and Soul—together form that Body which we call the Church. To meet, then, the requirements of man,—body and soul,—a Kingdom and Church must be founded for him, material, tangible, and visible, with a visible Polity and a visible administration.

Let me now draw your attention to what Holy Writ and the ancient Fathers utter concerning this question, viz. the Visibility of the Church.

1. Our Lord Jesus Christ was a Visible Person. He was born of a holy, immaculate, visible Virgin; He was a visible Infant, a visible Child, a visible Man. He made the atonement in a visible manner. If He suffered internally as regards His Soul and His mind, He likewise suffered externally and visibly as respects His Body. The agony in the Garden, the condemnation, the flagellation, the crowning with the Crown of Thorns, the fearful

progress along the Way of the Cross, were all dread visible realities. The nailing of the Hands and Feet on the Cross, the torments of the Elevation, and the suspension on the bloody gibbet, were facts patent to the senses of all, for all observed His sufferings and death. But what has this to do with the case, you will probably ask me? Very much. You remember how certain heretics of old denied the reality of the crucifixion and death of Christ, and affirmed that His sufferings were illusory, and that what was seen on the Cross was not Christ in very person, but His shadow, for they held He suffered only in appearance. They who deny the fact of a visible Church are descendants of these heretics. The ancient heretics denied the visible reality of the atonement, and the moderns deny the visible reality of His Mystical Body—the Catholic Church.

2. The Sacraments of the Church are visible. Baptism is a visible Sacrament; so is Confirmation; so are the Sacraments of the Eucharist, Extreme Unction, Order, and Matrimony. The minister of each is visible, so also the parties concerned. But the Eucharist is, if I may say so, an especially visible sacrament, for of what does it consist in relation to our subject? (1) It is the visible worship of God by visible men and women; (2) it is a visible sacrifice, by which the death of Christ is celebrated and shown forth; (3) it is the manifestation of the God-Man, who is daily offered in an unbloody manner for both the living and the dead, as is so forcibly expressed by S. Paul in the following language: "Who hath

bewitched you that you should not obey the truth, before whose eyes Jesus Christ hath been evidently set forth, crucified among you?"*

3. The provision made for administrating justice in the court of the Empire-Church in like manner proves its visibility. If a brother trespass against another, "Go," directed our Lord, "and tell him his fault between thee and him alone: if he shall hear thee, thou hast gained thy brother. But if he will not hear thee, then take with thee one or two more, that in the mouths of two or three witnesses every word may be established. And if he shall neglect to hear them, tell it unto the Church; but if he neglect to hear the Church, let him be unto thee as an heathen man and publican."† Are not these proceedings of a nature visible and cognizable to the outward senses? The two brothers, the remonstrance, the admonition, and the expulsion, are these not tangible realities?

The very insignia, which symbolize the judicial authority of the Empire-Church, whether in matters of faith or discipline, indicate this truth in an intelligible form; for "the Keys," what are they but a substance which may be seen and handled by men? They are as visible and real as the Sword of State, which represents the judicial and executive authority of the Crown. It seems to me that this description of the high court of the Empire-Church, which was instituted by Jesus Christ Himself for the trial of offences, indicates exhaustively the

* Gal. iii. 1. † S. Matt. xviii. 15–17.

visibility of the Empire-Church which He founded, and which is now existing universally in every part of the world.

4. The intercommunion of all the faithful is not merely an inward, but an outward act: "And they continued steadfastly in the Apostle's doctrine and fellowship, and in the Breaking of the Bread and in the Prayers"; "and they, continued daily with one accord in the temple, and breaking Bread from house to house, did eat their meat with gladness and singleness of heart."* This intercommunion of fellowship, "the Breaking of the Bread" and "the Prayers," and carrying the Bread broken from house to house, were each of them outward acts, and done by visible men, being visible members of a visible Church.

5. The descent of the Paraclete upon the Church, in fulfilment of the promise of Christ, was a visible phenomenon. A Spirit cannot be seen by mortal eyes, and therefore it takes a form in order to be manifested. When the Holy Ghost descended upon Christ, He came in the shape of a dove; and when He fell on the Apostles and others, He did so under the form of "cloven tongues like as of fire." † And since then, and even at this time, the Holy Ghost is manifested by the Catholic Church especially through her visible Head as represented by the Chair of S. Peter.

6. If Christ had intended to found an invisible Church, that is, if His disciples were to be simple believers, whose obligations were to consist merely

* Acts ii. 42, 46. † Acts ii. 3.

in offering private prayers and making inward acts of Faith, Hope and Charity, then there would have been no need of Churches, Apostles, Priests, and Sacrifice, because under such conditions every man would be, properly speaking, his own Church, his own Apostle, his own Priest, himself offering up his own spiritual sacrifice, as was practised in patriarchal times. But this idea is not in harmony with S. Paul's teaching: "How then shall they call on Him in whom they have not believed? and how shall they believe in Him of whom they have not heard? and how shall they hear without a preacher? and how shall they preach, except they be sent? As it is written, How beautiful are the feet of them that preach the gospel of peace, and bring glad tidings of good things."*

Doubtless the internal motions of a man's soul are invisible, but we see from the above extract that he is not merely to be taught inwardly by the Holy Ghost, but outwardly by a visible minister sent expressly to teach him (for to "hear" a preacher is the same thing, ordinarily speaking, as to see him), and sent to him by a visible authority—viz., the Church of God. This is mainly confirmed in the case of the Ethiopian eunuch, who was studying the fifty-third chapter of Isaiah, but was unable to understand its meaning until Philip the deacon unfolded it audibly to him, preaching Christ, the result of which was his visible reception into the visible Church by the visible Sacrament of Baptism.† And indeed, as is evident, our Lord did

* Rom. x. 14, 15. † Acts viii. 26–40.

openly appoint Apostles and others as a visible hierarchy, with a visible altar and visible sacraments, the materials of which were and are still bread, water, wine, and oil, showing thereby the visibility of the Church He founded.

7. The visibility of the Church is emphatically demonstrated by the various descriptive types and tropes found in Scripture, such as "Mountain," "Stone," "Rock," "City," &c.

"It shall come to pass in the last days, that the Mountain of the Lord's House shall be established on the top of the mountains, and shall be exalted above the hills; and all nations shall flow unto it."* "....And the Stone that smote the Image became a great Mountain and filled the whole earth."† "But in the last days it shall come to pass that the Mountain of the House of the Lord shall be established in the top of the mountains, and it shall be exalted above the hills; and people shall flow unto it. And many nations shall come and say, Come, and let us go up to the Mountain of the Lord and to the House of the God of Jacob,"‡ &c. "Ye are the Light of the world: a city that is set upon an hill cannot be hid. Neither do men light a candle and put it under a bushel, but on a candlestick: and it giveth light unto all that are in the house. Let your Light so shine before men that they may see your good works, and glorify your Father which is in heaven."§ "... The House of God, which is the Church of the Living God, the

* Isaiah ii. 2. † Dan. ii. 35. ‡ Micah iv. 1, 2.
§ S. Matt. v. 14–16.

Pillar and ground of the truth."* And again: "Thou art Rock [Peter], and upon this Rock I will build My Church."† It really needs no argument to prove that every one of these tropes represents the Church, not as an invisible but as a visible Body, a visible Empire, consisting of material beings, "all nations" "and people" "flowing into it."

Who can deny that a "mountain" is a visible object? What is the purpose of planting the Church on the "top of the mountains" and exalting her "above the hills," if not that she might be seen by the bodily eyes of men? Even the "mountain" of the New Jerusalem, which has descended from heaven, whose foundations are the Twelve Apostles, and whose wall and building are composed of precious stones, is an indication of its visibility. For it is, and ever will be, "a city set upon an hill" which "cannot be hid." It is the Light, "not under a bushel, but on a candlestick," seen by all, and giving light to all in the house, that is, the Church; for her "good works" are to shine before men, that they may be seen by men, and God be glorified.

The Church is represented as a Pillar, on which all may lean, to receive visible and tangible support against error. She is also represented by the Rock, expressive of her great power and strength. But this Rock was and is not only a thing, but a Person. "Thou art Rock," said Christ to S. Peter, "and upon this very Rock will I build My Church"; and thus he became, as S. Augustine says, "the

* 1 Tim. iii. 15. † S. Matt. xvi. 18.

very Person of the Church," by whom she was visibly manifested: and not only by S. Peter, but also by his Successors for the time being, whose Chair—the one Chair of Peter—ever stands upon the imperishable and immovable Rock.

Other biblical tropes indicate the same idea of visibility; as the "Bride" or "Spouse," the "Temple," the "Vineyard," the "Dove," &c., all which are visible objects, to be discerned by the senses of our common humanity. It is clear, then, to demonstration that the Church of Christ is not only an invisible body, but one that is visible, tangible, and substantial, to be regarded and handled, as the Lord Himself was after His resurrection, when He said: "Behold My Hands and My Feet, that it is I Myself: handle Me, and see; for a spirit hath not flesh and bones, as you see Me have. . . . Have ye here any meat? . . . And He took it, and did eat before them."* The Church is not a phantom, but a substantial reality, composed of flesh and bones, like her risen Lord, eating, even as He eat, in the presence of the world.

It will, however, be held by some that I am unmindful of the fact that there is such a thing as an invisible Church. No, I have not forgotten this fact; but what do we understand by an invisible Church? Is it the Church in heaven? if so, then, of course, it is to us, in our mortal condition, invisible.† But it is not the Church in

* S. Luke xxiv. 39–43.

† I would here observe that the Church in heaven is not an invisible Church. It is indeed so to us at present, that is, so long as we are in this world; but those who are in heaven are to each

heaven that is alluded to by the opponents of the idea of a visible Church. They assert that the true Church *on earth* is not visible: by this they mean that Christ did not institute a visible Church and hierarchy to which all the baptized are bound to adhere, but simply a communion consisting of "true believers," as they are called, subject to no spiritual authority whatever, except only to Christ Himself. In a word, they maintain that the worship of God and communion with Him are simply internal acts, no outward or visible organization being necessary. This is rank heresy; but, as I have proved that Christ did institute a visible Kingdom and Church, it is unnecessary to say more on that subject. And yet these opponents are so far right, that the Church is invisible, for she is both visible and invisible. How can she be

other visible creatures, forming the visible Church, consisting of a nine-fold visible hierarchy, over which reigns supreme as Visible Head our Divine Lord; and there too is enthroned, as a visible Queen, our gracious and Immaculate Lady. We are told that S. Stephen and S. Paul saw our Lord in heaven, and that the latter was caught into the third heaven, "and heard unspeakable words which it is not lawful for a man to utter"; and again, S. John saw our Lady clothed with the sun, the moon under her feet, and crowned with a diadem "of twelve stars." In truth, there is no such thing as an invisible Church distinct and separate from the visible Church. The Church on earth is visible, the Church in heaven is visible likewise, that is, to those who are in heaven: and will be some day to ourselves if we, by God's mercy, ever enter the *sanctum sanctorum* of the Lord of Hosts. Wherever the Church is, it must be a visible body according to that law of sight, that obtains in every department of the universe, either in heaven, or on the earth, or under the earth.—Acts vii. 55; 2 Cor. xii. 4; Rev. xii. 1.

both visible and invisible? I think our own selves will furnish the best illustration how this is so. A man is a creature both visible and invisible. We have, properly and strictly speaking, never seen our father, our mother, wife, relatives, or any other man or woman; nay, we have never seen our own selves, for all that we have ever seen and handled is the outward form and shape of man; but the Soul, wherein is the Personality, we have never seen, and can never look upon until we quit this world. All that we observe are the manifestations of the soul by means of those external organs which God has provided for it. The inmost thoughts of the soul, its ideas and aspirations, we are not cognizant of until it has revealed them by some outward action through its visible members. God alone is able to see the soul, *i.e.* the Person of man.

Man, then, is both a visible and an invisible creature; and so is the Church of God, which is an aggregation of all baptized men and women united together into one Body and Soul under Christ the Head. The Body—that is, the external organization of the Church—is visible; the hierarchy, the altar, the sacrifice, the adoration, are all visible; but the Spirit, which is the source of the power of the Priesthood and of the efficiency of its ministration, as well as of the fervour of the adoration of the worshipper, is invisible, and can be discerned by none except God. The interior worship and adoration of God, the meditation, contemplation, and communings that are continually springing upwards to the Heart of Jesus, are undiscernible

by man, unless there be at the same time some outward manifestation. There is the invisible Church on earth, but it is not separate or distinct from the visible Church. If the visible and the invisible Church could possibly be separated, the former would become extinct, and the latter could exist no longer on earth. Like the soul of man, on the death of its body it would wing its flight to Him who created it. It is true also, that while every baptized man and woman is a member of the visible, not all belong to the invisible, Church. Apostates, heretics, schismatics, and others who, being orthodox, do not live holy lives, may be members of the visible Church. But none of these are of the invisible Church, and none who remain outside this external circle can be saved; for, as the Apostle tells us, without faith and without good works none can be saved.

But the object of this chapter relates to the visible Church, that is, to the outward and visible form of that ecclesiastical polity which Christ established upon earth in the persons of S. Peter and the Apostles, and which was destined to continue as such till the consummation of the world.

The Catholic Church, then, is a visible Body, as much so as we ourselves are visible, having an outward form and administration, with a Soul within—its focus of light, and its source of life and devotion—manifesting itself by means of that external organization which Christ our Lord created for this purpose.

§ 1.

Doctrine of the Fathers.

The Fathers are very decided on this point of visibility.

S. Irenæus, A.D. 178.

"Wherefore the Lord did even give it [the Vineyard, *i. e.* the Church, no longer hedged round, but thrown open throughout all the world] to other husbandmen, who render the fruits in their seasons, the beautiful elect Tower being also raised everywhere. For the illustrious Church is [now] everywhere, and everywhere is the wine-press digged, because those who receive the Spirit are everywhere."*

"For to man is entrusted the Light of God. . . . For the Church preaches the truth everywhere, and she is the seven-branched candlestick which bears the Light of Christ."†

"For the Church has been planted as a garden [paradise? *paradisus*] in this world; therefore says the Spirit of God, 'Thou mayest eat of every tree of the garden; that is, Eat ye of the whole Scripture,"‡ &c.

Under the tropes of "Vineyard," the "Tower," the "Seven-branched Candlestick," and "Paradise," the visibility of the Church is taught. A vineyard is a place where vine-diggers and vine-pressers work; the "Tower" which rises in the middle is an object seen by all; the "Seven-branched Candlestick," *i. e.* the seven graces of the Holy Ghost. Here the inner man is enlightened by beholding the visible Light of Christ. "Paradise" likewise denotes visibility: it is also susceptible to the senses of touch and taste. A garden is made (1) to please the eye, (2) to please the feelings, and

* Adv. Hæres. l. iv. c. xxxvi. n. 2.
† *Ib.* l. v. c. xx. n. 1. ‡ *Ib.* n. 2.

(3) to gratify the appetite. So you see that under these several tropes is taught the visibility of the Catholic Church, which has been spread everywhere and seen by all.

S. Clement of Alexandria, A.D. 190.

Commenting on Ezekiel xxxiv., he says:—

"These are the promises of a good Shepherd: 'Feed us, Thy children, as sheep; yea, Lord, fill us with Thy pasture of righteousness; yea, Pedagogue, feed us on Thy holy Mountain in the Church, which is on high, above the clouds, touching the heavens.'"*

The mountain is a visible object, and comment is unnecessary.

Origen, A.D. 216.

"But if we read as Aquila writes, 'in my mountain'; the 'mountain' of Christ is to be understood [to signify] His Church, which is lofty and raised up on high. To this 'mountain' has been given by the Father, according to His good pleasure, an unshaken Empire, for the Church rules over all the earth and reigns with Christ."†

"We are not to give heed to those who say, 'Behold, here is Christ,' but do not show Him in the Church, which is filled with 'brightness from the east even unto the west; which is filled with true light; is the pillar and ground of truth'; in which, as a whole, is the whole advent of the Son of Man, who saith to all men throughout the world: 'Behold I am with you all the days of life even unto the consummation of the world.'" ‡

Origen says distinctly that the prophetic "Mountain" is the Church of Christ; therefore, as the Mountain is unquestionably an object visible to

* Pædag. l. i. c. ix. p. 148, edit. Venet. 1757.

† T. ii. Select. in Ps. xxix. p. 642, edit. Paris, 1732.

‡ T. iii. Comm. in Matt. (Tr. 30), n. 46.

all men, so also is the Church. The Church, then, is "lofty and raised up on high," reaching unto the clouds, in order that the gaze of the world may be attracted to it, and to the luminous brilliancy with which it is surrounded. You remember what Josephus said concerning the former Temple; how, being covered with plates of gold, it shone with glory, and when the unclouded sun was at its meridian, no mortal eye could rest on that glorious fane in consequence of the intense brilliancy of light reflected from its gold-encircled walls. So the Church exalted on high is a beacon of light visible to all, illuminating the faithful, but blinding aliens and evil-disposed men. This Mountain-Church is an Empire, according to this Father, bearing rule over all the earth and reigning with Christ. Here then is a visible, tangible, and substantial Kingdom, as much so as England or France is to our senses. This is evidently in allusion to the Stone Daniel saw fall upon the head of the Roman empire (*i. e.* the feet of Babylon), which took possession of it, and grew from thence into a mighty Empire, conquering the whole world, building up what was good, but crushing and consuming all evil nations. Here is a visible power, whose light is visible, and whose operations are apparent to all.

Eusebius, A.D. 325.

Commenting on Zech. xiv. 4, he says:—

"The mount of Olives, here spoken of, is indeed, according to the words read, 'over against Jerusalem, and to the east of it';

but besides this, according to the sense, it is the Holy Church of Christ, and the mountain upon which it has been based, of which the Saviour teaches, saying, 'A city set on an hill cannot be hid, being—instead of Jerusalem, which has fallen and never risen—raised up and found worthy of the feet of Christ; and this is not only 'over against Jerusalem,' but is 'to the east of it,' having received the rays of that Light by which we worship God, and being much before Jerusalem, and nearer to the Sun of Justice, of whom it has been said: 'Unto those that fear Me the Sun of Righteousness shall arise.'"*

The visibility of the mountain and the Church set thereon is further made plain by the reference to our Lord's sermon when He said, "A City set upon an hill cannot be hid." She is the Light reflected from the Sun of Righteousness, which is Jesus Christ, to dispel darkness, to enlighten the world, and to show the way to eternal life. The symbol "Light," to perform its function, must be seen and apprehended. If not, then it fails in its proper object, viz. to be seen. The City of God, stationed upon the top of the mountains, is evidently a city visible to all; if not, why should it be planted on so lofty an eminence? If not intended to be visible, but merely to be contemplated by the mind, then its foundation in the lowest valley would suffice for the purpose. What God intended was to illuminate the world, to cast out darkness, and subdue it to Himself; and inasmuch as the soul is taught and led by outward means, that is by the senses, it was necessary that the "City of God" should be erected high above the hills, in order that all might view it, contemplate it, and be guided

* Dem. Evang., l. vi. c. xviii. p. 289, edit. Colon. 1688.

along the road to eternal life, on which its beacon-luminary casts its rays of light.

S. Athanasius, A.D. 362.

"Understand by the 'Throne' of Christ the Church; for in it He rests. The Church of Christ, then, he says, shall be refulgent and enlighten all under heaven, and be abiding as the sun and the moon. For the passage says so: 'His Throne as the sun before Me, and as the moon perfect for ever, and a faithful witness in heaven.'"*

S. Optatus of Milevis, A.D. 368.

"It is written in Isaias the prophet, 'The law shall come forth from Sion, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem'; not, therefore, on that Mount Sion does Isaiah look down upon the valley, but on that holy mountain, which is the Church, that mountain which lifts its head over the whole Roman world under heaven. In which mountain the Son of God rejoices that He has been by God appointed King, saying in the first Psalm, 'For He has appointed Me King over Sion His holy mountain,' to wit, the Church of which He is King and Bridegroom and Head. . . . The Spiritual Sion is therefore the Church in which Christ has been appointed King by God the Father, a Church which is throughout the world, wherein there is one Catholic Church."†

S. Basil, A.D. 370.

In his discourse on Isaiah ii. 2, he says:—

"The House of the Lord, 'prepared on the top of mountains,' is the Church, according to that declaration of the Apostle. 'Know,' he says, 'how thou oughtest to behave thyself in the House of God, which is the Church of the Living God, whose foundations are on the holy mountains, for it is built upon the foundation of the Apostles and prophets. One of these mountains

---

* T. i. Expos. in Ps. lxxxviii. 38, p. 922, edit. Patav. 1777.

† De Schis. Donat., l. iii. n. 2.

was Peter, upon which Rock the Lord promised to build His Church."*

These three Fathers I have just quoted certainly do indicate very plainly the visibility of the Catholic Church of Christ. S. Optatus says (1) that the mountain is the Church of God, over which Christ has been appointed King, Bridegroom, and Head; and (2) that, according to S. Athanasius, this Church is the "Throne of Christ," in which "He rests." Why is the Church a "Mountain," and why a "Throne"? Obviously that He who "rests" in His Throne situated on high might illuminate the whole world, that the Church of Christ might be refulgent, and enlighten all the world; (3) that, as S. Optatus says, this Sion is situated on the mountain, that it may "lift its Head over the whole Roman world under heaven"; and (4) that this mountain "is Peter, on which Rock the Lord promised to build His Church." Now here we are able to grasp our subject more firmly. Taking these three Fathers together, we learn (1) that the Church is everywhere, "over the whole world"; (2) that it possesses a locality in the midst of her universality, namely, a particular mountain which is the mother of all mountains, viz. the mountain of Peter; for S. Basil says, "one of these mountains is Peter, upon which Rock the Lord promised to build His Church." It is that "Mountain which lifts its Head over the whole Roman world under heaven"; upon that object the eyes of the world would instantly be

* T. i. Comm. in Isaiah ii. n. 66.

fixed, because it is there where the Son of God reigns in His triple office of "King, Bridegroom, and Head," and that visibly, according to the law which He has ordained, that is, by "the Mountain of Peter." Where is the Mountain of Peter situated? It is where the Head Mountain of the Roman empire is situated—where is that? Rome, for Rome was the head of the empire, and is now the Head of the Empire of Christ—at least, so says S. Ambrose, who describes it as "the Head of the Roman world—the Roman Church, from whence flow unto all the rights of venerable communion." Rome, *i. e.* the Holy Roman Church, the "Mountain of Peter," under which his relics now lie, is that Luminary which enlightens all the world, which every true soul regards with steady unflinching gaze, even as the eagle, whose eye never quails before the dazzling brightness of the sun at the height of its exaltation. The Apostolic mountains, then, are the visible representatives of the one Church of God: one of them—even the Mountain of Peter—on which is situated, as it were, the Throne of Christ, where, by means of His Vicar, He rules over His universal Roman empire, that is the Catholic Church which has supplanted it, and from whence radiates that divine Light, by which the world is guided into all truth, and every faithful soul led on to the celestial mountains in the Paradise of heaven.

S. Chrysostom, A.D. 387.

"For see not I pray, merely that the Church is on the earth, but also that she has her dwelling in heaven—whence is this

manifest? The evidence of facts demonstrates it. Eleven disciples were warred against, the entire world opposed them; but the opposed conquered, and the opponents have been removed: the sheep overcame the wolves. Thou hast seen the Shepherd sending His Sheep into the midst of wolves, so that they might not, even by flight, secure their safety. What shepherd did this? Even Christ did it; that He might show thee that these good deeds are not in accordance with the natural course of events, but above nature and in that usual course. For the Church is more firmly rooted than heaven. But perhaps the Gentile condemns me of boasting. But let him wait for the proof of these things, and learn the power of truth; how it is an easier thing for the sun to be quenched than for the Church to be made invisible."*

S. Chrysostom, with his usual perspicuity, here demonstrates the visibility of the Catholic Church. He acknowledges the Church to be twofold, *i. e.* partly in heaven—which of course to us in our mortal condition is invisible, with which I have nothing to do in this discourse—and partly on earth, which is visible. That visibility is demonstrated by the open fight between "the eleven disciples" and the "world," and the collision between the "sheep" and the "wolves." "We are made a spectacle unto the world" says S. Paul, "appointed to death";† that is, that we shall conquer notwithstanding persecution and martyrdom: or as this Father expresses it, "the sheep were sent into the midst of wolves, so that they might not even by flight secure their safety"; "warred against, the entire world opposed to them"; but he adds, "the opposed conquered, and the opponents have been removed; the sheep overcame the wolves." Now this was the "spec-

* T. vi. Hom. iv. In illud, Vidi Dom. n. 2.

† 1 Cor. iv. 9.

tacle" the world saw—the new Church in opposition to the world, the ignorant sent to confound the wise; the foolishness of the Cross in opposition to the false philosophy of the ancients, and let me add, moderns too; the impotence of a few, in open antagonism with the omnipotence of the many great ones on the earth: in a word, the "sheep" pitted against the "wolves." This was the spectacle before the world in the time of the Apostles; this is the spectacle before the world now. It was and is an open fight between two visible bodies, the Church on the one side, and the world on the other. "Do you consider," says S. Chrysostom, I am "boasting"? Do you deny the Church to be thus visibly antagonistic and invincible? Learn the power of the truth, "how it is an easier thing for the sun to be quenched than for the Church to be made invisible." The Church therefore is a visible communion.

S. Augustine, A.D. 400.

"You know, and indeed you own, that the Holy Ghost came down in this manner, in order that they whom He thus filled might speak in every tongue. What meant that sign and prodigy? . . . This was said in regard of those who, after having received the Holy Ghost, were to speak in every tongue. But because that same miracle signified that, in all nations and tongues, the Gospel would be, and the Body of Christ would speak aloud in every tongue throughout the world, there is added, 'Their sound has gone forth into all the earth, and their words unto the ends of the earth.' Hence it is that the true Church is hidden from no one. For this cause is that which Himself says in the Gospel, 'A city set on an hill cannot be hid.' For this too is appended in the above Psalm (xviii.), 'He hath His Tabernacle

in the sun,' that is, in open view (id est in manifestatione), as we find in the Book of Kings, 'What thou hast done secretly thou shalt suffer in the sight of the sun.' *

"Behold wherefore is she called Catholic. But you with closed eyes so stumble against that mountain, which from a small 'stone,' according to the prophecy of Daniel, 'increased and filled the whole earth.' . . .†

"May God withdraw thee from the party of Donatus, and recall thee to the Catholic Church, whence they snatched thee when a catechumen, and bound thee with the chain of a deadly honour. Then shall the 'dew of Hermon' upon the mountains of Sion be partaken in by thee: ye are not in the mountains of Sion, because ye are not in the 'city set upon an hill,' which has this sure mark, that 'it cannot be hidden.' It is therefore known to all nations. Now the party of Donatus is unknown to many nations; it is not therefore that city."‡

You are doubtless aware that in the time of S. Augustine the Donatist Church was a powerful community, numbering as many bishops as the Catholics had in Africa. This great Father applied all his great power of mind in opposition to this schismatic community, endeavouring to persuade Petilianus and other eminent men to return to the true Church. His argument against the Donatists demonstrates the visibility of the Catholic Church. He says that by virtue of the descent of the Holy Ghost under the form of tongues of fire, the Church became so universal and so apparent to all as to force men to take cognizance of her, for "the true Church," he says, "is hidden from no one"; and he compares it to the "city set on an hill," showing manifestly its visibility. He also

* T. ix. contra Lit. Petil., l. ii. n. 74.
† *Ib.* n. 90. ‡ *Ib.* n. 239.

compares it to the mountain, the issue of a small "Stone," which gradually "grew and filled the whole earth."

As I have observed before, a mountain is a visible object; and hence the Church, which it aptly symbolizes, is likewise visible. The last extract I have given is very decisive, and I think well worth consideration. S. Augustine contrasts the party of Donatus with the Catholic Church, and he tells the Donatist Petilianus, "You are not in the mountains of Sion, because you are not in the city set on an hill," that is, in the visible Church of God. But he adds these words, "the city on an hill has this sure mark, that it cannot be hidden." Thus it follows that a most important and conclusive mark of the Church is that she "cannot be hidden"; therefore an essential feature in the Church is that she is visible. Now this is his strong point, that the Catholic Church is an object visible to the whole world, while you Donatists are "unknown to many nations": but all know the Catholic Church, because she is "a city set on an hill," even the Mountain of Sion, "which cannot be hid."

All see her, and feel her powerful touch; not a person of any intelligence can say that he is not acquainted with the Holy Roman Catholic Church, and of that claim which she makes to universal spiritual dominion. Holy Scripture and the Primitive Fathers clearly demonstrate the visibility of the Catholic Church. Neither the inspired writers nor the ancient Fathers had the slightest idea that the Church could be otherwise than a

visible body, with a visible Head, with visible Apostles, visible Priests, and with visible Altars, visible Sacrifices and Sacraments. Even the Saints who are hid in Christ are visible, for the Light within them shines forth, shedding effulgence all around, according to the word of our Lord, when He said: "Let your Light so shine before men, that they may see your good works, and glorify your Father which is in heaven."* The Saints are each of them stars, shining in the night of this world, every one of them receiving its illumination from the Sun, through her who rules over the night of this world, even her "that cometh forth as the morning rising, fair as the moon, bright as the sun, terrible as an army set in array."

The Catholic Church of Christ is therefore a visible Empire, bearing sway over all the earth; she is a visible Communion, the medium between God and Man, by and through the Sacraments; she is a visible Vineyard, whose lofty tower is conspicuous to all around; she is the visible Fold, wherein the sheep are grazing, which any one may see who uses his eyes; she is the Mountain of God, exalted above the hills, so that all dwelling in the regions on high or in the valleys below may observe her; she is the City of God, the New Jerusalem, resplendent with gold and silver and precious stones, and her distinguishing mark is that she "cannot be hidden;" she is the Temple of the true Solomon,

* S. Matt. v. 16.

whose brilliancy is so intense that no one can help seeing her Light; she is the Paradise of God on earth, wherein are beautiful and variegated sweet-smelling flowers, trees pleasant to the sight, and fruits in abundance, which gratify the palate. Such is the Church Catholic, a visible reality and not a phantom, a visible Body and not a spirit; flesh and bones, and not a shadowy immaterial evanescence. In one word, she is the visible Church of the Living God, the Pillar and Ground of the Truth, the Shrine of the Holy Ghost, who dwells within her, and the visible Tabernacle of Jesus Christ on earth.

CHAPTER IV.

RECAPITULATION.

In the foregoing chapters I have endeavoured to demonstrate the following facts, which really and truly are indisputable, at least by those who believe in a revelation, and who accept that Article in the Creed, "I believe in one holy Catholic and Apostolic Church." First, that from all eternity Almighty God designed the formation on this earth of a great universal Empire-Church, the confines of which should be conterminous with the utmost boundaries of this world. Secondly, that this great Empire-Church should be composed of every race of men, of every language and clime, which should be so welded together as to form in fact but one nation. Thirdly, that this Empire-Church should be co-extensive with the whole nature of man, that is, partly spiritual in respect to his soul, and partly material as regards his body; for both body and soul are the subjects of God's solicitude, being together heirs of that eternal inheritance which is to be the reward of all those who persevere to the end in truth and justice. Fourthly, that this universal Polity should be a visible, tangible, and substantial state, as much so as any kingdom in this world is to the eye and mind of any one of its citizens. And this because we ourselves are not

simply spirits, and never will be so (except for a comparatively brief season between death and the resurrection), but men composed of an earthly form no less than a spiritual one: for which reason the Son of God became visible when taking our nature upon Himself, and appointed, not angels, but visible men like ourselves, to be His Apostles and Teachers of the Gospel; and likewise instituted an Empire-Church as a visible object, as much so as a great mountain, on the top of which shines the brilliant beacon of salvation, visible to the eye of the body and of the soul, with visible rites and ceremonies, and visible sacraments and ordinances, the materials of which are visible and tangible substances. Indeed Christ Himself is made to us as visible as it is possible for Him to be under our present condition. For what do we see when the Blessed Sacrament of the Altar is lifted up? Is it not Christ Himself under the form of the Host? Such was the design of Almighty God, to create a visible Empire-Church on earth as a luminous City of Light on the top of the mountains; and can we do less than marvel at its incomprehensible immensity, its inconceivable grandeur, and its ineffable beauty?

Fifthly, that God intended that this new Empire-Church should grow and develop out of the typical kingdom of Israel. The peoples who were to form the substance of this Empire-Church were to be of the Seed of Abraham, not only by carnal, but also by spiritual generation, *i. e.* by a process or law not divorced from the flesh, but in intimate union with it. How was this to be? By Jesus Christ,

the Son of Abraham, according to the flesh, and the inheritor of the whole world by promise of the Father. But how would it effect our relationship with Abraham? By the union of our flesh with the Flesh of Christ, as really and substantially as if we had been born members of his family according to the ordinary law of nature. But how so? By the Sacraments, and principally by the laver of regeneration: thus we are born again and made "members of His Body, of His Flesh, and of His Bones."

So New Jerusalem and all Jews (*i. e.* Christians) were to unfold out of Jerusalem of old and from the stock of Abraham; and this by and through Jesus Christ, the last King of the Jews, the heir to the throne of David, and of the promises made to Abraham, whose seed should be as the dust of the earth for multitude, and as the stars of heaven in their myriads upon myriads.

Sixthly, that while the plans of God were developing in the growth of His ancient kingdom, He was preparing at the same time a polity remarkable for its beauty of order, for its completeness of organization, and for its universality of dominion, which at the proper time should become the outward form and autonomy of the future universal Empire-Church of Christ. I mean, as I have shown, that the dominion of Rome was to become the spiritual heritage of Christ and His Vicar S. Peter; that the throne of Cæsar—who was both Emperor and Pontifex Maximus—should pass into the possession of the Chiefpriest of the Empire-Church; the offices of Pontifices to the Pontiffs of

the Catholic Church; and that Imperial Rome and the capital cities of the ancient pagan empire should become the seats of government of the Empire of Christ, and of the various provinces in every part of the world.

Let us pause awhile and ponder upon the magnificence of the godlike plan, for the moulding into one dominion, all the peoples of the world, whose Prince, the Vicar of Christ, should reign supreme, when "swords should be beaten into ploughshares" and "spears into pruning-hooks"; and when all men should adore the Most High, singing His praises with one mouth and from one heart. Satan, no doubt, has watched his opportunities to mar so grand a work; he has indeed succeeded in leading astray thousands from this universal Empire, but only for a season, for the prophecies must of necessity be fulfilled, and consequently the time is approaching when God's universal Empire-Church, with its Supreme Pontiff, will be master of the whole earth, and will reign spiritually as King of kings and Lord of lords.

Such are the facts concerning the divine intentions. We have seen how they have been fulfilled; we have seen how Christ, before His departure, did really and truly institute His universal Empire-Church; and we also observe as a matter of fact that the universal Church still exists, of which the world is witness, as is too plainly manifest by the frantic efforts made to effect her destruction; or if that is impossible (which it is), to so muzzle her mouth and enchain her hand as to render her powerless to do,

what the world calls, mischief. But as Samson of old broke like threads of cotton the bands that bound him, and snapped asunder the pillar that supported the building that enclosed his enemies, so the true Samson will set himself free from his enemies, and uproot the foundations of all those kingdoms which mar the work of God on earth. This is no romance, but sober truth. It is what the prophets have said, it is what has been going on from age to age till now, which is enacting before our very eyes, and will continue so to be enacted till the end.

BOOK V.

THE CHARACTERISTIC MARK OF THE CHURCH.

CHAPTER I.

INTRODUCTORY.

We have seen how prophecy of old foretold and foreshadowed that great Empire-Church which our blessed Lord founded upon the earth in the days of His Flesh: a Kingdom and a Church which was to be universal, its substance formed out of the Jewish race, its framework being mainly that of the Roman empire, which was soon to be consumed and absorbed within its loving embrace. It was not to be supposed that Satan would remain quiescent without making violent efforts to corrupt and destroy this great universal Empire of the Lord. He would assault it at first outwardly, attacking its rulers and people, disposing the heathen world to persecute them, banishing some to distant lands, or casting them into loathsome prisons, seizing their goods, and reducing them to poverty and starvation; and at other times driving them in hecatombs into the Coloseum and amphitheatres in Rome and else-

where, to become first the sport of insulting multitudes, and then the food of lions and tigers.

Failing in thus effecting the destruction of the people of God by fire, by sword, and by wild beasts, Satan would strive to compass his end by corrupting them through the two great powers of our nature, viz., our passions and the subtleties of our intellect, leading astray some by the pleasures of the world and the flesh, and by raising up heretics within the fold, who by their impious and blasphemous sophistries would deceive many to their destruction. Our dear Lord and His Apostles, who foresaw these dangers, took loving care to forewarn the Church, and to provide such means as would be sufficient for the protection of all persons of good-will. "Woe unto the world because of offences [*i. e.* scandals], for it must needs be that offences [scandals] come."* "And many false prophets shall rise, and shall deceive many. And because iniquity shall abound, the love of many shall wax cold. But he that shall endure unto the end the same shall be saved. . . . For there shall arise false Christs, and false prophets, and shall show great signs and wonders; insomuch that, if it were possible, they shall deceive the very elect. Behold I have told you before" [beforehand].† "For I know this, that after my departure shall grievous wolves enter in among you, not sparing the flock. Also of [from] your own selves shall men arise speaking perverse things, to draw away disciples after them."‡

* S. Matt. xviii. 7. † *Ib.* xxiv. 11–13, 24, 25.

‡ Acts xx. 29, 30.

"For such are false apostles, deceitful workers, transforming themselves into the apostles of Christ. And no marvel; for Satan himself is transformed into an angel of light. Therefore it is no great thing if his ministers also be transformed as the ministers of righteousness; whose end shall be according to their works." * "But there were false prophets also among the people, even as there shall be false teachers among you, who privily shall bring in damnable heresies, even denying the Lord that bought them, and bring upon themselves swift destruction. And many shall follow their pernicious ways; by reason of whom the way of truth shall be evil spoken of." † "I know thy works and thy labour, and thy patience, and how thou canst not bear them which are evil, and thou hast tried them which say they are apostles and are not, and hast found them liars." ‡

The Empire-Church, it will be observed, was to be persecuted not only from without, that is by heathen and infidel powers, but *from within* by wicked Christians. From the very beginning, even before the death of our beloved Lord, this inward persecution would commence. Within the college of the Twelve, over which Christ presided in Person, Judas the Apostle rebelled against his Master: his first heresy was the denial of befitting honour to the Lord, on pretence of serving the poor, when S. Mary Magdalene poured out the sweet balsam on His Head. He has had many followers in this

* 2 Cor. xi. 13–15. † 2 S. Peter ii. 1, 2. ‡ Rev. ii. 2.

error, who under the mask of providing for the indigent poor, ignore the duty of adorning the Sanctuary of his Presence. Judas very soon afterwards showed himself in his true colours by betraying his Master into the hands of His enemies.

And during the Apostolic times, how many of the baptized fell away and became apostates, such as Simon Magus, Ananias and Sapphira, Demas, and hosts of others, who were in their time "false apostles" and "false teachers," "wolves in sheep's clothing," who under the guise of shepherds devoured the sheep. And since the death of the last Apostle, how many heretics have arisen within the fold, scattering the sheep hither and thither, poisoning the pasture by their false teaching, and lying deceits: such were Novatian, Arius, Montanus, Nestorius, Eutyches, Apollinaris, Photius, Wickliffe, the Lombards, Huss, Luther, Calvin, Melancthon, Socinus, Cranmer, and Parker who consummated the Anglican schism and apostasy. But among all heretics none are so dangerous as bad Catholic kings and princes, &c., for they have it in their power, God permitting it, to enable heresiarchs to effect finally and almost irrevocably material schism.

The wicked Emperors of the East, Henry VIII. and Queen Elizabeth, and in modern times the so-called King of Italy, are striking examples of what evil-minded princes can do, when they fall from their integrity, and become the scourges of the faithful. All this our Lord had foreseen, for the long vista of secular and ecclesiastical history was before His eyes, and He graciously

and mercifully uttered the above words in order that we, being forewarned, might be forearmed. But Christ was not satisfied with merely forewarning us; He designed that the Empire-Church, though continually the prey of the wicked, should nevertheless be for all time the sure harbour of refuge: and with this view, He determined to so frame it, that, while many of its members might fall away, itself should never fail, should never cease to be what He made it, but should be in every age a visible beacon, to which all men of God might look up, and without fear follow its infallible light. The peculiar characteristic which He stamped upon this Empire, and which was to be indelible, was its perfect unity,—unity in organism, unity in faith, unity in dogma, and unity in its cardinal points of discipline. This unity is of a fourfold nature, viz., oneness, indivisibility, indefectibility, and infallibility. These four points, taken together, form a perfect unity; so perfect, that none but the Hand of God could have produced it; and hence it will follow that that Church which can exhibit this fourfold unity must be of God; and those churches or conventicles that cannot exhibit them are nothing else but the handiwork of men, described in Holy Writ as "the synagogues of Satan."

CHAPTER II.

ONENESS.

The Church under the Mosaic dispensation was an exhaustive symbol or type of the perfect oneness of the Catholic Church. There was only one Highpriest, one altar, one priesthood under the authority of the one Highpriest, sacrifices offered only in one place, one Holy of Holies, wherein was deposited the one ark and mercy-seat, to be visited every year once only by the Highpriest; the whole being circumscribed in one building by the four walls thereof, and open only towards heaven. There could not be a severer or more complete type of the perfect oneness of the Catholic Church.

The Catholic Church is the same as to oneness as the Jewish Church, being four-square, being bounded by her four walls, the difference being that the New Jerusalem is no longer limited to a given locality, as Jerusalem of old had been, but has for her confines the whole earth, the world above and the regions below the earth, as alluded to in Rev. v. 13. Our Lord's own words are a fitting commentary on the above: "I appoint unto you [the Twelve] a Kingdom, as My Father hath appointed unto Me; that ye may eat and drink at My table in My Kingdom, and sit on

thrones judging the Twelve Tribes of Israel."* The type and the antitype agree in this, that the Church of God is one.

This truth is directly asserted by the following: "And other sheep I have which are not of this [*i. e.* the Jewish] fold: them also I must bring, and they shall hear My Voice; and there shall be one Fold and one Shepherd."† "For we have many members in one Body: . . . so we being many are one Body in Christ, and every one members one of another."‡ "Be of the same mind one toward the other."§ "That ye may with one mind and one mouth glorify God, even the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ."‖ "Now I beseech you brethren, by the Name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye all speak the same thing, and that there be no divisions among you; but that ye be perfectly joined together in the same mind and in the same judgment."¶ "For by one Spirit we are all baptized into one Body, whether we be Jews or Gentiles, whether we are bond or free; and have been all made to drink into one Spirit."** "Now therefore we are no more strangers and foreigners, but fellow-citizens with the Saints, and of the Household of God; and are built on the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ Himself being the Chief Corner Stone; in whom all the Building fitly framed together groweth unto an holy temple in the Lord; in whom ye also are builded for an Habitation of

* S. Luke xxii. 29, 30. † S. John x. 16.
‡ Rom. xii. 4, 5. § *Ib.* 16. ‖ *Ib.* xv. 6.
¶ 1 Cor. i. 10. ** *Ib.* xii. 13.

God through the Spirit." * "Of whom the whole Family in heaven and earth is named." † "There is one Body, and one Spirit, even as ye are called in one hope of your calling; one Lord, one Faith, one Baptism," "one Bread," "one God and Father of all." ‡ "Let us walk by the same rule, let us mind the same thing." § "Ye also as lively stones are built up a spiritual House, an holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God by Jesus Christ. . . . . But ye are a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, an holy nation, a peculiar people; that ye should show forth the praises of Him who hath called you out of darkness into His marvellous Light." ||

Such are the principal passages in support of the perfect oneness of the Catholic Church: and they present, (1) under the tropes of a "Body," a "Family," a "Temple," a "House," a "Habitation," "City," "Nation," &c., oneness as to her outward form; (2) under the names of "Head," "Apostles," "Pastors," &c., oneness as to her Hierarchy under Jesus Christ her great Highpriest; and (3) under the terms "Table," "Altar," "Spiritual Sacrifices," "Baptism," and "Bread," we have unfolded to our view the unity of the Church's worship, all her numerous members worshipping God by "spiritual sacrifices" offered at the one Altar-Table of the Empire-Church of God by the one hierarchy, and presented to God the Father by the one Highpriest of the Catholic

* Eph. ii. 19–22. † *Ib.* iii. 15.
‡ *Ib.* iv. 4–6; 1 Cor. x. 17.
§ Philip. iii. 16. || 1 Peter ii. 5–9.

Church, the Lord Jesus Christ Her Head and Master. The unity of the members of the one Church, both external and internal is equally prescribed: (1) they are all to be "members one of another," being "fellow-citizens" not of the saints only but of "the Household of God," all "speaking the same thing," and all being joined together "in the same judgment," for the "faith" is one: and (2) they are to be united in one mind and heart, all thinking alike, and glorifying God by "one mind and one mouth."

§ 2.

Doctrine of the Fathers.

The holy Fathers have written a great deal on the subject of the unity of the Church which is well worthy of careful consideration.

S. Ignatius, A.D. 107.

"There is one Jesus Christ, than whom nothing is more excellent. Do ye therefore all run together as into one Temple of God, as to one altar, as to one Jesus Christ, who proceedeth from one Father, and is in One and to One [*i. e.* the Father] returned."*

"Of this fruit we are, by His divinely blessed Passion, that He might set up a standard [or sign] for all ages, through His resurrection, to all His holy and faithful [followers], whether among Jews or Gentiles, in the one Body of His Church."†

It is clear that S. Ignatius taught that, as the Father is one, and Christ one, so the "Temple

* Ad Magnes., c. vii. † Ad Smyrna., c. i.

of God" is "one," the "Altar" "one," and the very "Body of His Church" "one."

S. Justin Martyr, A.D. 139.

Explaining Ps. xliv., he says:—

"Therefore these words testify explicitly that He is witnessed to by Him who established these things, as deserving to be worshipped as God and as Christ. Moreover, that the Word of God speaks to those who believe in Him, as being of one soul and one synagogue, and as one Church, as to a daughter; that is to the Church, which is derived from, and partakes of, His Name; for we are called Christians." *

S. Justin's testimony is the same in effect as that of S. Ignatius; "one Soul," "one Synagogue," is the "one Church" of Christ. But there is one point here which is to be noted, viz. that the Church is "one Soul." The Church is frequently compared to a human body, which is a perfect representation of unity. Now a man possesses a body and a soul, an outward and an inward part, a visible and invisible substance: so does the Church. The Church has both an outward and an inward part, a temporal form and a spiritual counterpart, a visible and invisible existence; and these are so constituted, that while the two parts are each one, the two form a perfect unity. The Church thus is constituted as "one Soul" and "one Body," similarly as men are constituted; and these two make up that complex unity which in a person we call a man, and in the Kingdom of God the Church.

* Dial. cum Tryphon., c. 63.

S. Irenæus, A.D. 178.

"The Church having received this preaching and this faith, although scattered throughout the whole world, yet as dwelling in one house, carefully preserves it. She also believes these truths, as having but one soul and one and the same heart, and she proclaims and teaches them, and hands them down, with perfect harmony, as if she possessed but one mouth. For although the languages of the world are various, yet the import of the tradition is one and the same. . . . But as the Sun, the creature of God, is one and the same throughout the whole world, so also the preaching of the Truth shines everywhere, and enlightens all men that desire to come to the knowledge of the truth."*

You perceive the unity of the Church is compared to "one House," "one Soul," "one Heart," and "one Mouth," the truth proclaimed by one voice, by one spirit, by one impulse, by one intonation, which, like the Sun in the natural order, shines everywhere, enlightening all who are willing to know the one Church and the one Truth.

S. Clement of Alexandria, A.D. 190.

"The way of truth is one, but other streams run into it from various quarters as into a perennial river."†

"There is in truth one covenant of salvation, extending from the foundation of the world to our time, which, according to the difference of generations and seasons, is supposed to be given in different forms. For it is fitting that there should be one unchangeable gift of salvation, proceeding from one God, through our Lord conferring its benefits in different ways [that is, by the covenant of Moses, and afterwards enlarged on the coming of Christ]. On this account, the middle wall which

---

* Adv. Hæres., l. i. c. x. n. 2.

† T. i. Strom., l. i. p. 331, edit. Venet. 1757.

separated the Greek from the Jew is removed, so as to form a peculiar people; and thus to attain to the unity of the faith, and there is one election from both."*

"From what has been said, it is I think plain that the true Church is one, that which is truly ancient. . . . For as there is one God and one Lord, on that account also that which is most highly precious is praised, because it is one, being an imitation of the one Principle. The one Church then is associated to the nature of the One, which Church these men violently attempt to divide into many heresies. In substance, in doctrine, in origin, in excellence, we say the ancient and Catholic Church is unique [*i. e.* unlike any other communion or sect], collecting through our Lord into the unity of the one faith, according to the peculiar covenants, or rather to the one covenant, at different times, by the will of God. . . . But the excellency of the Church, like the principle of everything concrete, is in unity surpassing all other things, and having nothing similar or equal to itself."†

This great Father lays it down that the "way of Truth is one": there cannot be two ways of Truth, for two roads as a rule tend to different destinations. We Christians are travelling to heaven; that is the object of our journey. We start from various countries and climes, as "streams flowing from various quarters," making for that one way of Truth, which alone leads us to heaven. This Father has well put it when he says the "way of Truth is one." He further asserts that there is "one Covenant of salvation, beginning from the foundation of the world to our time." Adam received a covenant from the Lord under the sign of the future Virgin-Mother, whose Son should bruise the head of the Serpent; Abraham received a covenant under the form of the promised Seed, in

* T. i. Strom., l. vi. p. 793. † *Ib.*, p. 899.

whom all nations should be blessed; Jacob, too, under the seal of the change of name into Israel, received the covenant, limiting the course of its operation to his own family, and chiefly in Judah. This covenant was subsequently formalized by Moses, who became the father and ruler of the Israelites. And when we arrive at the period of Christ's advent and departure, we find this covenant enlarged and amplified, so as to include the whole human race; its old law of rites and ceremonies, together with its priesthood, which concerned the offering of bulls and goats, were abolished, and a new Sacrifice and a new Priesthood instituted, and Sacraments ordained, as well as a new law, suitable for all the spiritual and temporal needs of men. All these covenants, says this Father, are "one," "given in different forms," "according to the difference of generations and seasons," their one object being the formation of "a peculiar people," who, by "attaining to the unity of the faith," and by following that "one" royal "way of Truth," shall in due course of time come to the inheritance provided for them by God on the close of this dispensation. The object of this Father is to show that "the way of Truth is one," not two; that the covenants made at different times are all "one" in substance, and not diverse; and that the people constituted by these covenants are not divided, but form one nation; that is, "as streams flowing from various quarters," they form in the one "perennial river" one race, a "peculiar people," who walk "in the unity of the faith" and in the one way of Truth.

This great truth S. Clement enforces more strongly when he asserts that "the ancient and Catholic Church is unique," *i. e.* that it is different from all other communities; for while they differ from each other and among themselves, the Catholic Church ever exhibits a perfect unity in "one faith," which, "like the principle of everything concrete, is in unity, surpassing all things, and having nothing similar or equal to itself." For the unity of the Church is like the unity of God; "for," he adds, "as there is one God and one Lord," so is the Church one, "being an imitation of the one Principle," *i.e.* God. And S. Clement well says that the "one Church" is consequently "associated to the nature of the One," for "in substance, doctrine, origin, and in excellency," she is "unique," being an exact counterpart, or imitation, or figure, or representation of the unity of God. She is, through her union with God, the manifestation of God upon earth. It is this august communion, which heretics strive to divide and cannot, because she is one, being the similitude of the one Principle, *i. e.* God.

This magnificent passage of Clement clearly witnesses to the perfect unity of the Catholic Church.

Origen, A.D. 216.

"We say that the divine words declare the whole Church of God to be Christ's Body, animated by the Son of God, and that all they who are believers are members of that same Body, as of a whole; since, as the soul gives life to, and moves the body, which is not born so as to have vital motion of itself, so the Word moving to what is needful, and acting inwardly on the whole Body, the

Church, moves also each member of those who pertain to the Church, in such wise that they do no one thing without the Word."*

This is an important passage, which seems at first sight to support those who believe that they can be in communion with the Soul of the Church while outwardly in a state of alienation from the Body. Doubtless all the baptized are members of the Church, and so long as they continue conjoined to Christ in His Body, the Church, they receive the benefits derived by His precious grace. But Origen compares the Church to the Body of Christ, in which there is a Soul, that is the Word, who is its animating principle, "moving to what is needful, and acting inwardly [as the soul does in the natural body] on the whole Body of the Church, moves also each member of those who pertain to the Church."

The soul moves and acts through the whole body of a man, animating not only the body, but every member thereof; but if an arm or a leg be amputated by the surgeon or lost by an accident, it ceases to animate it, and in due time the limb becomes dead matter. So also the Church; the "Word," *i. e.* the Soul, "moves each member" of the Body of the Church, but "only those who pertain to the Church"; those members who do not "pertain to the Church" cease to be animated by the "Word." Hence we draw from this the absolute oneness of the Body and Soul of

* T. i. contra Cels., l. vi. n. 48.

the Church; the excommunicated or amputated members thereof cease to be part of the Church, and like the natural limb, become dead and putrid.

This I think is illustrated by another passage from the same writer: "If thou eatest the Word of God in the Church, and eatest also in the synagogue of the Jews, thou transgressest the commandment which says, 'In one House shall it be eaten.' But if thou partakest of the Word of God in one house, the Church, then, having left it, thou undertakest to partake of God in an heretical synagogue: though the command says, 'In one House shall it be eaten,' thou dost not eat in one House. Therefore understand by one House, the Church; eat not therefore by any means of the Lamb out of the Church."* And again: "Christians are not one nation, but out of all nations one people; and therefore did Moses, as the highest honour, designate them as 'not a nation,' but, if the expression be allowable, 'a nation of all nations.'"†

From these two extracts it is clear that the Body of Christ is absolutely one, consisting only of those who are conjoined members thereof, who partake of the "Word" in "one House," and who themselves form "the one Nation of the nations," the one City which is walled round so as to exclude the unfaithful. Origen holds the absolute unity of the Church.

* T. ii. Select. in Exod. xii.

† T. iv. in Ep. ad Rom., l. viii. n. 6.

S. Cyprian, A.D. 248.

"There is one God, and Christ is one, and the Church one and the Chair one, founded upon the Rock by the Word of the Lord. Another altar cannot be constituted, or a new priesthood be made, besides the one altar and the one priesthood."*

"Why do we accept an adulterous and alien Church, a foe to the divine unity, when we know only one Christ and His one Church? . . . Whither is he to come who thirsts? Shall he come to the heretics . . . or to the Church which is one, and is founded upon one [*i. e.* Peter] who has received the Keys of it by the voice of the Lord? It is she who alone holds and possesses all the power of her Spouse and Lord. In her we preside," &c.†

There are many other passages respecting the unity of the Church which I shall reserve for the present, but enough has been quoted to show that S. Cyprian believed that the unity of the Church was a reality, that, as God and Christ are one, so is the Church, the altar, and the priesthood one, being founded upon one, even Peter, who received the Keys; which Church "alone holds and possesses all the power of her Spouse and Lord."

S. Hilary of Poitiers, A.D. 356.

"But since the Body of the Church is one—not a body made up by a kind of confused mixture of bodies, nor by each of them being gathered together into an indistinguishable heap and shapeless mass—we are all, through the unity of faith, through the brotherhood of fellowship [or communion], through the concord of deeds and wills, through the gift of the Sacrament which is one in all, one Body, to which Paul exhorts, saying, 'I beseech you,

---

* Ep. xl. ad Pleb., pp. 53, 54, edit. Paris, 1726.

† Ep. lxxiii. ad Jubaian., p. 132.

brethren, that ye be all of one mind, exercising the same charity.' And when it shall be according to what is written, 'And the multitude of believers had but one heart and one soul,' then shall we be the city of God, then the holy Jerusalem, because 'Jerusalem is built as a city, whose participation is of the self-same thing.'"*

Observe the notes of unity as maintained by this great Father: "unity of Faith," all believing the same thing and united in the same judgment; "brotherhood of fellowship," *i. e.* all joined together by inter-communion; "concord of deeds and wills," that is, agreement in all manner of ecclesiastical acts, and all willing alike, and all submitting their wills to each other, so that their wills may be uniform throughout the whole Church; "the gift of the Sacrament," which is one in all of us, that is, among those who are one in faith, one with the one brotherhood, and one "in deeds and wills." Mere sacramental communion is not sufficient as a test of a person being in union with the Catholic Church, either outwardly or inwardly; all schismatic bodies which have retained the Apostolical succession can receive the Body and Blood of Christ, though such an act be wicked, unlawful, and sacrilegious, as S. Cyprian said; but this, as I have just asserted, is not sufficient, unless we are united in the faith and with the brotherhood, and unless our conduct be in harmony with the "deeds," and our desires in conformity with the "wills" of the whole Body. For, as S. Hilary says, "But dissenters from the assembly of the saints, and they who, urged on by their sins, separate themselves

* T. i. Tract. in Ps. cxxi. n. 5.

from the Body of the Church, have no participation in this holy House."* So it is clear that, assuming that a schismatical body possesses the priesthood, the sacraments which it celebrates are of no avail for unity; on the contrary, they are a cause of offence to real unity, being celebrated sacrilegiously, in opposition to the Church. All the notes of the Church must be in tune, otherwise unity and concord are endangered.

S. Athanasius, A.D. 362.

Alluding to the Arians, he says:—

"This, as the Pastor has said, is the offspring of the devil, and is the mark of taverners rather than teachers. For that, as the Fathers have handed down, is sound doctrine; and this is the mark of those who teach truly, viz. to confess mutually the same things, and not to have any controversy either amongst themselves [*i. e.* respecting the dogma the Arians denied] or with their Fathers. . . . But the holy and veritable heralds of truth are of one mind with each other, and differ not among themselves. For though they lived at different periods, yet do they conspire together for the same object, being prophets of one God, and preaching harmoniously the same word."†

"There must be no adoration out of the Church; but in the very court of God is it to be performed. . . . The holy Court of God is one."‡

No controversy on vital doctrine disturbs the serenity of the true Church. Those like the Arians who are addicted to such unholy controversy cease to be in the Church. The true Pastors all "confess

* T. i. Tract. in Ps. cxxi. n. 5.

† T. i. De Decret. Nicæn., n. 4.

‡ T. iii. in Ps. xxviii. p. 66, edit. Patav. 1777.

mutually the same things," according to the uniform tradition of the Fathers, who, though they lived at different periods, yet all "conspire together for the same object, being prophets of the one God and preaching harmoniously the same word." This is the true "mark," by which the true Church is known, viz. unity of doctrine. The Church too as a "Court" is one; no "adoration" can be performed "out of the Church," "but in the very Court of God." According to this great champion of truth there is but one doctrine, one teaching, one Church, and one adoration.

S. Cyril of Jerusalem, A.D. 363.

"We would next say something concerning the Holy Ghost, not to declare with precision His substance, for that is impossible, but to state the various errors of some concerning Him, lest we may at any time fall into them from ignorance; and to cut off the ways of error, that we may journey on the one royal road."*

What a testimony is this against the Oriental Church, who will not confess the Procession of the Holy Ghost from the Son no less than from the Father. In this respect they have departed from the "one royal road"; but of this I may have something to say further on. The point in the above extract is the necessity of perfect orthodoxy in the faith, and of following that "one royal road" that leads to heaven, for all other roads lead, as S. Cyril implies, to hell.

* Catech. xvi. n. 5.

S. Gregory of Nyssa, A.D. 370.

"Whoso has learnt that Christ is the Head of the Church, let him, before all things, bear this in mind, that the Head is ever of the same nature and substance as the Body beneath it; and there is a certain coherence of each of the limbs with the whole. . . . Whence, if any part be out of the Body, it is utterly disconnected with the Head."*

What a perfect picture this is of the unity of the Church of Christ. The Head and the Body are one, of one substance and of the same nature. Christ is the Head, the Church is the Body attached to it, and the members are the limbs joined to the Body.

S. Basil, A.D. 370.

"It is more just that we be judged, in what regards ourselves, not by one or two who walk not according to truth, but by the multitude of bishops, who by the favour of the Lord are united with us. Let the question be put to those of Pisidia, Lycaonia, of Isauria, of both Phrygias, of that part of Armenia that borders on your country, of Macedonia, of Achaia, of Illyricum, of Gaul, Spain, the whole of Italy, Sicily, Africa, the sound districts of Egypt, and what is left of Syria; they all send letters to me, and receive mine: from which letters, whether sent by them or received from us, you may learn that we are all unanimous, and think the same thing. So that it will not escape your accuracy, that whoso flees from communion with us, severs himself from the whole Church."†

S. Basil maintains here that unity lies in the multitude of bishops, that is, with the universal brotherhood cleaving to one another, as S. Cyprian said. For single churches to fly from the com-

* T. iii. De Perfect. Christ. Forma, p. 289, edit. Paris, 1638.

† T. iii. p. 2, Ep. cciv. ad Neocæsarienses, n. 7.

munion of the Catholic Church is to cut themselves off from the whole Church. If this be true, how can any one deny that the unity of the Church is a cardinal doctrine? For if the "multitude of bishops" form one brotherhood, "all thinking the same thing," then is the doctrine one, and the Church one Body.

S. Cyril of Alexandria, A.D. 424.

Commenting on Lev. xvii. 3, he says:—

"It is therefore unlawful and a profanation, and an act the punishment for which is death, to love to associate with unhallowed heretics, and to unite oneself to their communion: for they sacrifice out of the Holy Tabernacle the Victim which is offered for sins, and do not perform the sacred sacrifice within the holy places. For the Church is one, even as there was also one tabernacle of old, and one tabernacle which pointed out in a type the beauty of the Church."*

As the ancient ecclesiastical economy was one, so is "the Church one." This unity is demonstrated by S. Cyril, when he asserts that it is "unlawful and profane . . . to associate with unhallowed heretics and to unite oneself to their communion": the punishment for this is "death," that is, the death of the soul. And this is further shown by S. Cyril when he implies that the sacrifice of the Victim must be performed "within the holy places," in the one Church. According then to this Father the Church is one, as one as was the Tabernacle of old.

* T. i. Glaphyr. in Lev., l. i. c. i. p. 351, edit. Paris, 1638.

From the above extracts from the Fathers it is evident that they one and all maintained the doctrine of the unity of the Church. Under various forms is this doctrine taught; as, for instance, "One Temple," "One Altar," "One Church," "One Body," "One Soul," "One Synagogue," "One Priesthood," "One Brotherhood," "One Court"; the One Church proceeding from the "One Lord," inspired by "One Spirit," connected together by the "One Chair," His divine love flowing from "One Heart," proclaiming the Father of All by "One Mouth," being united in one judgment, "all speaking the same thing."

CHAPTER III.

INDIVISIBILITY AND INDEFECTIBILITY.

THE Church is indivisible and indefectible. It is convenient to consider these two points of unity together, because the Scripture proofs that establish the one, are equally available to establish the other. The two words—indivisible and indefectible—doubtless both imply much the same truth, nevertheless are they distinct, for the former denotes the Church to be organically as well as morally one, so much so that under no conceivable circumstance can she ever be divided into independent and hostile parts; and the latter denotes the point that she can never fall away from true faith and morals. The utmost Satan can do is to decoy from the Church individual members, and entrap them into the meshes of heresy and wickedness, and to injure the Church in her external form by the destruction of her material churches, monasteries, and other property.

With regard to the evidence from Scripture, and the argument founded thereon, I shall reproduce, with a few alterations, what I wrote in my former work, and especially for this reason, that not one of those who have done me the honour of noticing that work, has thought it worth his while to make any remarks on what I have published.

"Upon this Rock I will build My Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it."* In these few words are enunciated two important points, viz. unity and indefectibility. The solid Rock is itself a symbol of indivisible unity, of massive strength, of irresistible power, and undecaying durability. Christ Himself comments, by anticipation, on the nature of this symbol: "Whosoever heareth these sayings of Mine, and doeth them, I will liken him unto a wise man, which built his house upon a rock: and the rain descended, and the floods came, and the winds blew, and beat upon that house: and it fell not; for it was founded upon a rock."† And He contrasts this with the foolish man, who built his house on the sand: "And the rain descended, and the floods came, and the winds blew, and beat upon that house; and it fell: and great was the fall of it."‡ The rock, then, was the indefectible foundation of the house of the wise man, and consequently it was able to resist all the violence of the elements; while the house which was erected by the foolish man fell, because, being built upon the sand, it had no real foundation. Christ, the great Master-Builder, erected His House upon the solid Rock, and notwithstanding the rains, the floods, and the hurricane, it stood, because it was founded upon the Rock.

But, perhaps, you will say that a Rock may be rent by the violence of nature, and that which was once one rock might become two or more rocks. In

* S. Matt. xvi. 18. † *Ib.* vii. 24, 25. ‡ *Ib.* 26, 27.

answer to this objection, I would point to the words above quoted, "And the gates of hell shall not prevail against it"; that is, against the Church so built on the Rock. Whether or no this might be possible through the violence of nature concerns us not, because we have a solemn guarantee given us, on the most sacred word of Christ, that against the House or Church which He founded upon the Rock of His appointment "the gates of hell shall not prevail"; therefore that Rock which He selected as the basis of His Church cannot be divided or broken; and the Church built thereon, partaking as it does of the unity, power, and strength, and even of the very substance of that Rock, can neither be divided nor broken.

Again. The Rock is not merely an inert or lifeless foundation; it is, as S. Peter and S. John imply, a living Stone. It is a Stone which grows. Daniel, in his prophecy of the Church, declares that the Stone which smote the Image, and cast it down, "became a great mountain, and filled the whole earth"; and it is added, that this Mountain-Kingdom "shall never be destroyed"; nor be "left to other people, but it shall break in pieces, and consume all these kingdoms, and it shall stand for ever." * There cannot be a more perfect symbol than this universal mountain, or a trope more expressive of an indivisible unity, and an incorruptible indefectibility. For how can such a mountain as this, which fills the whole earth, be ever divided into separate parts; and what chance or possibility

* Dan. ii. 35, 44.

exists of the hand of man destroying this impenetrable unity? The Rock-Mountain, then, is a symbol of the perfect unity and indefectibility of the Empire-Church of Christ. When, then, our Lord said, "Upon this Rock I will build My Church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it," we are to understand that that Church —not every church, but that Church only which was built upon the Rock of His selection—is one, indivisible, and indefectible, for its unity cannot be divided, nor can it be broken in twain, for "the gates of hell shall not prevail against it."

But the Lord has, in His mercy and goodness, left on record, for our solace and assurance, that magnificent Prayer which He addressed to the Father for the perpetual unity of His Church and Kingdom. He thus prayed: "I have given unto them [the Apostles] the words which Thou gavest Me.... I pray for them; I pray not for the world, but for them which Thou hast given Me; for they are Thine.... Holy Father, keep through Thine own Name those whom Thou hast given Me, that they may be one, as We are.... Neither pray I for these alone, but for them also which shall believe on Me through their word; that they all may be one; as Thou, Father, art in Me, and I in Thee, that they also may be one in Us; that the world may believe that Thou hast sent Me. And the glory which Thou gavest Me I have given them; that they may be one, even as We are one: I in them, and Thou in Me, that they may be made perfect in one; and that the world may know that

Thou hast sent Me, and hast loved them as Thou hast loved Me." *

After reading these words of our Lord, "Upon this Rock I will build My Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it," and this most beautiful and touching Prayer, how is it possible that that Church and Kingdom which He instituted could ever really be divided or broken? For not only has He given us His most solemn word that it never should be, but He has addressed to His Father this intercessory Prayer for the perpetual unity of His Church, first as represented by His Apostles, and secondly by those who should "believe through their word." But what was the nature of that unity for which Christ prayed? Let us examine carefully the words He employed: "That they all may be one, as Thou, Father, art in Me, and I in Thee, that they also may be one in Us.... I in them, and Thou in Me, that they may be made perfect in one."

The unity, then, which Christ desired for His Church was a unity resembling that of the Three Persons in the Most Holy Trinity. "As Thou, Father, art in Me, and I in Thee," so I beseech Thee, "they also may be one in Us," such is the prayer. The Unity in the Holy Trinity is one of Substance, consequently the Holy Trinity is said to be undivided, for it is impossible to divide that Substance. As They were one, one with each other, and in each other, being all Three of one Substance, so is the Church which Christ

* S. John xvii.

established on the Rock, against which "the gates of hell shall not prevail," for she is one in Christ, being Bone of His Bone and Flesh of His Flesh, by the union of Water and Blood, which flowed from His wounded side, even as Christ is one with the Father; so it must follow that as the Holy and Blessed Trinity is one and indivisible, *i. e.* the Substance cannot be divided, so also the Church, which is the Body of Christ, is one and indivisible.

It is impossible, then, not to perceive that the Empire-Church which Christ designed was one which was perfect in all respects,—perfect as to its foundation—a Rock; perfect in its superstructure; perfectly impregnable against all the forces of the infernal powers, and perfectly united in its organic constitution, for it is as thoroughly one in God, and in itself, as "the Trinity in Unity" and "the Unity in Trinity."

But further, in order that you may see how this indivisible and incorruptible indefectibility is a characteristic of the true Church, let us consider some passages which still further enforce this great truth.

I have already pointed out the great mountain which covered the whole earth as being the most perfect symbol of this unity and indefectibility. There are other tropes which, in their degree, equally represent this truth. "The Kingdom of God is like to a grain of mustard seed, which a man took and sowed in his field: which indeed is the least of all seeds: but when it is grown, it is the greatest among herbs, and becometh a tree, so that the birds of the air come and lodge in the

branches thereof."* This type of unity is analogous to that of the Stone—the small Stone—which struck the colossal Image (*i. e.* the fourth universal empire) on its extremities, and, destroying it, occupied its place, and thence grew into a great mountain, filling the whole earth. Now a tree is a perfect unity, for it consists of three organic parts—the root, the trunk, and the branches. These cannot be divided without producing the dissolution of the part severed. The branch cannot live separate from the trunk, nor can the trunk apart from the root. A tree is an indivisible unity; it cannot be divided without causing the destruction of the tree; but, on the other hand, the root and the trunk possess an inherent life independent of the branches, so much so that, if many were cut off, the tree would still remain whole, and also would still retain its inborn vigour. The Church is likewise compared to a human body, which, like the tree, consists of three main divisions—the head, the torso, and the members. The members cannot exist apart from the body, nor the body from the head; but so long as the head and the body are united, a man may live his allotted time, in health and vigour, even if several of his members had been amputated.

Now the Empire-Church which Christ constituted is His Body, and it can no more be really divided than a tree or a human body. Its unity is not broken, though many of its members have been severed from its body. As the tree and the human

* S. Matt. xiii. 31, 32.

body both retain their perfect unity and indefectibility, though divested of some of their respective branches and members, so also the Empire-Church: the loss of the Greeks on the one side and of the Anglicans on the other may, indeed, have terribly shaken it, but its unity and indivisibility, notwithstanding, remain intact.

The Empire-Church can be no more divided than Christ Himself. S. Paul asserts that in his Epistle to the Ephesians: "There is one Body, and one Spirit, even as ye are called in one hope of your calling; one Lord, one Faith, one Baptism, one God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in you all."* As, then, God is one, Christ one, and the Holy Ghost one, so also is the Body of Christ, that is, the Church. As, then, God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost, are each an indivisible Unity, and together form one Undivided Unity, so also is the Kingdom and Church one, and organically indivisible, and absolutely indefectible; for as the Three Blessed Persons cannot be severed from each other or be injured by the armies of hell, no more can this Empire-Church be severed in twain or broken by the hand of man or devil.

I might continue the Scriptural evidence for this absolute oneness aud indefectibility by referring to an enclosed city, a house, or building, or family,†

* Eph. iv. 4–6.

† Our Anglican friends are fond of quoting this comparison, as they think it supports the possibility of the one Church, through special circumstances, over which she has no control, becoming divided into separate and hostile communities, on the principle

each of which fully sustains the idea of this perfect unity.

One point, then, in the character and attributes

that when a family quarrel occurs, ending in separation, it still remains what it was before—one. But they forget two points, viz. that every family possesses a head, and that a member of the family who quarrels with that head, that is to say who rebels against the authority of his father, ceases to have any further connection with the said family. A son who is for grave faults expelled from the homestead cannot claim the love of his father nor the privilege of sonship, nor enjoy the society of his brothers; and even his mother, whose loving heart is perhaps breaking on his account, cannot clasp him to her bosom until he has made his peace with his offended father. The utmost she can do is to play the mother's part, interceding for him, softening the anger of his sire, and succeeding perhaps in mitigating the terrible sentence of expulsion. It is true the same blood runs through the veins of both parent and child, and that no separation can effect any change in this respect. But this is not the point at issue: it is not a mere question of relationship in blood, but of certain rights and privileges which are, in consequence of their separation, forfeited. We are all the children of God by a natural birth from Adam, the first man, and by a supernatural birth through the baptism of Water and the Holy Ghost. We are all of one family in blood, in the order of nature, by the blood of the first man; and in the order of grace by the Blood of the Second Man, Christ Jesus our Lord. Those who lead bad lives, or who violate unity by error in doctrine or discipline, do not cease to be the children of God, but yet they nevertheless forfeit their divine inheritance. Communities of baptized Christians, existing in a state of separation from the one Church, are indeed members by virtue of their baptism, yet, because of their separation, either through their own fault or that of their forefathers, they have no more connection with the said Church than a broken branch of a tree, notwithstanding it is of the same wood as the stem from which it grew and containing the same sap. The trope or type of a family by no means assists the cause of our High Church friends; on the contrary, it condemns them, because of their state of separation from the one indivisible

of that Empire-Church which Christ established has been proved from Holy Scripture, viz. her perfect indivisible unity and absolute indefectibility. It has been shown that Christ erected His Kingdom and Church on the Rock, which Rock grew into a great mountain filling the whole earth; and also that this Empire-Church, in accordance with the prophecy of Daniel, would "never be destroyed," but would "stand for ever." Our gracious Lord promised most solemnly, "The gates of hell shall not prevail against it," that is, it shall never be overcome with heresies, it shall never be divided, but shall stand in its perfect unity and strength for ever; it shall never decay by lapse of time, nor shall it ever be broken by the hand of man or by the shafts of the arch-enemy of mankind; and in order to sanctify this unity and indefectibility, our Lord offered on the eve of His Passion that sublime and most affecting prayer to His Father, by which he consecrated His new Kingdom and Church, sanctifying it by the word of truth, and cementing its unity in His own Blood, which He had just before offered to His Father, and which he was about on the morrow to shed in dread reality. This prayer alone is a guarantee of the indivisible unity and perfect indefectibility of His Church, to say nothing of His sacred promise, "The gates of hell shall not prevail against it," even that Church which

and indefectible Church. The family then, like the tree, the human body, and other similar tropes, are each an indivisible unity, and cannot be divided into independent hostile parts without destroying its position as a family.

was founded on the Rock of His selection—even Peter, *i. e.* the Rock Peter.

§ 1.

Doctrine of the Fathers.

The testimony of the Holy Fathers respecting the indivisibility and the indefectibility of the Church is extremely strong, and I think will demonstrate the utter impossibility of the Church ever ceasing to be outwardly or inwardly one, or of her ever being the subject of corruption, either in faith or morals. We will consider in the first instance the doctrine of indivisibility.

1.—INDIVISIBILITY OF THE CHURCH.

S. Irenæus, A.D. 178.

"And while these things were taking place his [Lot's] wife remained in Sodom, no longer corruptible flesh, but a pillar of salt, which endures for ever; and by those natural processes, which appertain to the human race, indicating that the Church also, which is the salt of the earth, has been left behind within the confines of the earth and subject to human sufferings: and while entire numbers are often cut off, the pillar of salt still endures, thus typifying the foundation of the faith, which maketh strong and sends forward children to their Father."*

This is a remarkable passage, setting forth under a figure the indivisibility of the Church. A "pillar" is an indivisible unity: it cannot be divided; for if it were so, it would cease to be a pillar. This pillar typified the Church in her character of indivisi-

* Adv. Hæres., l. iv. c. xxxi. n. 3.

bility, showing that the Church, which is the Pillar and stay of the Truth, cannot cease to be what it was originally, viz. an indivisible unity; that, like the human race, the Church is "subject to human sufferings," that is, she has the same trials, infirmities, and the same sorrows as human nature is liable to; but nevertheless she ever remains what she was, "a Pillar of Salt," though large bodies of members either fall away or are cut off by the hand of the executioner. This demonstrates clearly that the universal Empire-Church, which is "the salt of the earth,"—the one Pillar,—is an indivisible unity, that is, it cannot be divided.

S. Cyprian, A.D. 248.

"There is one God, and Christ is one, and the Church one, and the Chair one, founded upon the Rock by the word of the Lord. Another altar cannot be constituted, or a new priesthood be made, besides the one altar and the one priesthood."*

"And this unity we ought to hold and assert, especially those of us that are bishops who preside in the Church, that we may also prove the episcopate itself to be one and undivided; . . . the episcopate is one, each part of which is held by each one for the whole. The Church also is one, which is spread abroad far and wide into a multitude by an increase of fruitfulness. As there are many rays of the sun, but one light; and many branches of a tree, but one strength based in its tenacious root; and since from one spring flow many streams, . . . yet the unity is still preserved in the source. Separate a ray of the sun from its body of light, its unity does not allow a division of light; break a branch from a tree,—when broken, it will not be able to bud; cut off the stream from its fountain, and that which is cut off dries up. Thus also the Church, illuminated with the light of the Lord, sheds forth

* Ep. xl. ad Pleb., p. 53, edit. Paris, 1726.

its rays over the whole world, yet it is one light which is everywhere diffused, nor is the unity of the Body separated. Her fruitful abundance spreads her branches over the whole world. She broadly expands her rivers, liberally flowing, yet her Head is one, her Source one; and she is one mother, plentiful in the result of fruitfulness: from her womb we are born, by her milk we are nourished, by her spirit we are animated. . . . . And does any one believe that this unity which thus comes from the divine strength and coheres in celestial sacraments, can be divided in the Church, and can be separated, by the parting asunder of opposing wills? He who does not hold this unity [this indivisible unity] does not hold God's law, does not hold the faith of the Father and the Son, does not hold life and salvation."

Commenting upon the unity symbolized by the seamless robe, and the schism of the Israelites, ten sceptres being allotted to the one party and two the other, the party of the Lord, S. Cyprian continues:—

"As the twelve tribes of Israel were divided, the prophet Abijah rent his garment. But because Christ's people cannot be rent, His robe, woven and united throughout, is not divided by those who possess it; undivided, united, connected, it shows the coherent concord of one people who put on Christ. By the sacrament and sign of His garment He has declared the unity of the Church. Who, then, is so wicked and faithless, who is so insane with the madness of discord, that either he should believe that the unity of God can be divided, or should dare to rend it—the garment of the Lord—the Church of Christ? He Himself in His Gospel warns us, and teaches, saying, 'And there shall be one flock and one shepherd.' And does any one believe that in one place there can be either many shepherds or many flocks? . . . . Also, the sacrament of the Passover contains nothing else in the law of the Exodus than that the Lamb which is slain in the figure of Christ should be eaten in one house. God speaks, saying, 'In one house shall ye eat it,' ye shall not send its flesh abroad from the house. The Flesh of Christ and the Holy of the Lord cannot be sent abroad, nor is there any other home for

believers but the one Church. . . . Bitterness cannot consist and be associated with sweetness, darkness with light, rain with clearness, battle with peace, barrenness with fertility, drought with springs, storm with tranquillity. Let none think that the good can depart from the Church. . . . The Holy Spirit forewarns, and says by the Apostle, 'It is needful also that there should be heresies, that they which are approved may be made manifest among you.' Thus the faithful are approved, thus the perfidious are detected; thus even here, before the day of judgment, the souls of the righteous and of the unrighteous are already divided, and the chaff is separated from the wheat. These are they who of their own accord, without any divine arrangement, set themselves to preside among the daring strangers assembled, who appoint themselves prelates without any law of ordination, who assume to themselves the name of bishop, although no one [*i. e.* of the Catholic episcopate] gives them the episcopate; whom the Holy Ghost points out in the Psalms as sitting in the chair of pestilence, plagues, and spots of the faith, deceiving with serpents' tongue, and artful in corrupting the truth, vomiting forth deadly poisons from pestilential tongues; whose speech doth creep like a cancer, whose discourse forms a deadly poison in the heart and breast of every one. . . . We must withdraw, nay, rather flee, from those who fall away, lest, while any one is associated with those who walk wickedly, and goes on in ways of error and of sin, he himself also wandering away from the path of the true road, should be found in like guilt. God is one and Christ is one, and His Church is one, and the Faith is one, and the people is one, united into a substantial unity of body by the cement of concord. Unity cannot be severed; nor can the one Body be separated by a division of its structure, nor torn into pieces, with its bowels wrenched asunder by laceration."*

There is no doubt that S. Cyprian held, that the Empire-Church was an indivisible unity, that is, that under no conceivable circumstance could she ever be divided. He pronounces that the Church and the Chair are each one unity, even as God is

* De Unitate, pp. 195–197, 202.

one and Christ is one, founded upon the Rock; that the altar and the priesthood are one, and that the episcopate is "one and undivided." These assertions alone prove that the Church is not only one, but absolutely indivisible, that is, she cannot be divided into two or more independent and separate bodies. "Does any one believe," he asks, "that this unity . . . can be divided in the Church and be separated by the parting asunder of opposing wills?" "Who then," he again asks, "is so wicked," "so insane," as "to believe that the unity of God can be divided," or who would dare "to rend the Church of Christ"? for he asserts that "unity cannot be severed, that the one Body cannot be torn in pieces or her bowels wrenched by laceration." And he again asserts the precept that "God is one and Christ is one, His Church is one and the faith is one, and the people one." There have been many heresies and many schisms, that the faithful may be approved and the perfidious detected, but these form no part of the one Church. They were once in the Church, many of these perhaps exemplary bishops and priests, with many followers; but when they dissented from the one Church, her doctrine and discipline, they ceased to be of the Church, and their community remained no part whatever of the one Catholic Church. They ceased to be Catholics, and they became schismatics. S. Cyprian well puts it: "These are they who of their own accord, without any divine arrangement, set themselves to preside among the daring strangers [*i. e.* heretics and schismatics] assembled, who appoint themselves prelates without any law of

ordination, who assume to themselves the name of bishop, although no one gives them the episcopate," that is, no one of the "one brotherhood" has admitted them into that episcopate, which this Father says is "one and undivided."

In the various periods of the history of the Church, pseudo-churches frequently started into existence, disturbing the peace of the Church and jeopardizing the faith of many. As I pointed out above, there have been many schisms from the days of the Apostles till now, which, under their leaders, have succeeded in decoying thousands from the one indivisible Fold: these constitute the class of schismatics whom S. Cyprian declares "assume to themselves the name of bishop," breaking "the divine arrangement," *i. e.* the divine law, and ignoring the "law of ordination," which requires that true bishops should be sent by proper authority, even from that "brotherhood of the episcopate" which this great Saint pronounces to be "one and undivided." But notwithstanding all these schisms, the Empire-Church always remains an indivisible unity; for it is ever one, the "Chair" one, the people, *i. e.* the faithful, one, the altar one, the priesthood one, and the episcopate "one and undivided."

S. Cyprian proves the indivisible oneness of the Catholic Church in a variety of ways. He first points to the Chair, which he declares is one, as God is one and Christ one. If the Chair is one and undivided, then there cannot be, properly speaking, any other chair. There may be subordinate chairs, as there are many subordinate

secular thrones; but if the Chair is really one, as God is one, then clearly there cannot lawfully be a rival chair. Consequently the Empire-Church, united and subject to the "one Chair," cannot be otherwise than an indivisible unity. For if a rival chair be set up against the one Chair, it is, in the language of S. Cyprian, "without," *i. e.* it is outside of the Catholic Church; and the bishop who sits therein, together with all his followers, are, as is described by this same Father, strangers, aliens, profane, and adulterers, whom he compares to Core, Dathan, and Abiram. The one Chair must be located somewhere; where I will consider hereafter, and the Church in union with that Chair is alone the Empire-Catholic Church, all others being "without." The "One Chair," then, is the symbol of the indivisible unity of the Church.

Again, this Father compares this unity to the union that subsists between the "rays" of light and the sun, the branch and the tree, the stream and its source. "Separate a ray of the sun from its body of light, its unity does not allow a division of light; break a branch from a tree, when broken it will not be able to bud; cut off the stream from its fountain, and that which is cut off dries up." This fully illustrates the indivisible unity of the Church. Sever a number of bishops, priests, and people from the "one Chair," they cease to be bishops, priests, and people of the Catholic Church; for, like an amputated branch of a tree, it ceases "to bud" anew, and like a stream cut off from its source, "dries up."

The Church is also compared to "one Mother."

A Mother who bears and nourishes a child is one and indivisible; she cannot be divided into two mothers, each part possessing the power of fruitfulness; so the Church, described as "one Mother," cannot be divided, and in her separated parts bring up children to the one Lord.

But nothing illustrates this doctrine more forcibly than the rent garment of Israel and the seamless robe of Christ. S. Cyprian quotes the following passage from Scripture: "Take thou ten pieces, for thus says the Lord, Behold I will rend the kingdom out of the hand of Solomon, and I will give ten sceptres unto thee; and two sceptres shall be unto him for my servant David's sake, and for Jerusalem, the city where I have chosen to place my Name there." S. Cyprian thus comments: "As the twelve tribes of Israel were divided, the prophet Abijah rent his garment. But because Christ's people cannot be rent, His robe, woven and united throughout, is not divided by those who possess it; undivided, united, connected, it shows the coherent concord of one people [*i. e.* the faithful] who put on Christ. By the sacrament and sign of His garment He has declared the unity of the Church." The twelve tribes of Israel possessed twelve sceptres, and, we may add, twelve chairs or thrones, subject to one Throne, viz. that of David. Through their iniquities they fell, and were divided; but the kingdom remained in its integrity, because it was vested in the throne of David. But Christ, who established a twelvefold Princedom, with twelve chairs or thrones subject to one supreme Chair, —the "one Chair founded upon the Rock,"—

declared, under the type of the seamless robe, the absolute impossibility of the Church ever being rended into separate and independent parts. Hence all the Apostles were one, their several chairs united to the "one Chair on the Rock"; likewise, also, all the chairs of their successors in union with this "One Chair." Hence the Church is an indivisible unity; she cannot be sundered; she cannot be torn to pieces, for she is clothed as it were with the seamless garment of unity, which, under no conceivable circumstance whatever, can be rended or divided. S. Cyprian then teaches with great clearness the perfect and indivisible unity of the Catholic Church, demonstrating that she is absolutely one, composed of "one and undivided episcopate," "one priesthood," with "one people," having "one Chair," "one altar," and consisting of "one flock," "which cannot be divided" nor "separated by the parting asunder of opposing wills."

Anonymous, A.D. 254.

"The will of schismatics is not in the law; which law points out to us the Church as one and sole [singularem]; in that Ark, to wit, which, by the Providence of God, was built under Noah before the Deluge; in which Ark we find enclosed . . . not only the clean, but also the unclean, animals. That Ark alone, with those in it, was exempt from danger. . . . Whom will Christ the Lord deny above all others, but all you heretics and schismatics and aliens to His name? For you were once Christians, but now Novatians, and no longer Christians, have changed, by the name whereby you are called, your first faith by subsequent faithlessness."*

---

* Anonymi Tract. ad Novat. de Lapsis, Galland., t. iii. pp. 371–373.

The Church is "one and sole," she cannot commingle with any other body whatsoever; she is, and she remains, what God the Lord made her, absolutely and exclusively one. She cannot associate with any who do not accept her whole teaching, and she cannot tolerate the least divergence from any portion of her doctrine. This writer compares her to Noah's Ark, which rode in perfect safety upon the billows of the universal flood of water that overtook the earth. The Catholic Church being the Ark which floats upon the seething flood of iniquity and error, unscathed, without the slightest danger of shipwreck, "one and sole," is as indivisible as that which was framed and piloted by Noah. Some of her officers and men may transgress the laws of this Ark, for, like that of Noah, "it contains both clean and unclean animals"; and if they refuse to yield to discipline, may be ejected from the Ark; and others, again, may be so mad as to jump overboard, seizing some small boat, and attempt to set up a puny rival vessel; but the one Ark continues what it was before, viz. the Ark, "one and sole," and the small craft is soon wrecked.

S. Hilary, A.D. 356.

"Moses and Solomon established a tabernacle; and then the Apostles set up many Tabernacles, and in every part of the earth which can be penetrated—yea, even to the isles of the sea—did they prepare unto God many dwelling-places. . . . Not therefore one tabernacle, whether that of leaves by Moses, or that desired by David, or that adorned by Solomon with every human labour, does the prophet seek after, but many—yea, countless Tabernacles; because, though in the universe there be but one Church, yet has

every city its own Church; and though there be many Churches, there is one Church in them all, because there is one in many. For those, therefore, who are ascending to heavenly things, it is the first and greatest step to dwell in this Tabernacle [*i. e.* the one Church], and there day and night to pass the whole period of this life, aloof from the cares of the world. . . . After this there will be rest in the Mountain of the Lord [*i. e.* heaven], for they that go forth from the Tabernacle journey thitherward, and there is no road thither except through this dwelling" [*i. e.* the one Church].*

"But since the Body of the Church is one—not a body made up of a sort of confused mixture of bodies, nor by each of them being gathered together into an indistinguishable heap and shapeless mass—we are all, through unity of faith, through the brotherhood of fellowship, through the concord of deeds and wills, through the gift of the Sacrament which is one in all, one Body. . . . But dissenters from the assembly of the Saints, and they who, urged on by their sins, separate themselves from the Body of the Church, have no participation in this Holy House, because 'the participation of this city is of the self-same thing.' For they who are of one mind from the fellowship of a perfect city cannot have 'participation' in what is different, but in 'what is the same.'"†

Perhaps, while reading the above extracts, you are wondering how they prove the Church to be one and indivisible, especially as S. Hilary asserts that there are many Tabernacles or Churches, instead of one. But a little reflection will show that S. Hilary is in perfect agreement with contemporary and preceding Fathers on this subject. S. Hilary, in the passages quoted, contrasts the Church of Christ with that under the law. Moses and Solomon established one tabernacle, the Apostles many—"yea, countless Tabernacles." If so, how can the Church be one and indivisible? This same question

* T. i. Tract. in Ps. xiv. n. 3, 4. † *Ib.* Ps. cxxi. n. 5.

he has anticipated; for while he asserts that there are Tabernacles or Churches in every city, he at the same time affirms that there is "but one Church"; "there is one Church in them all, because there is one in many."

The doctrine of the Blessed Trinity comes to one's mind as illustrating this truth, one in many and many in one. We confess that there is one God and three separate Persons, that is, One in Three and Three in One; or, in the words of the Creed, "Unity in Trinity" and "Trinity in Unity." We confess, too, that each Person is God, not indeed Three Gods, but all Three One God. The Church is the one Body of Christ composed of many several Churches, scattered all over the world; yet the whole number of Churches form one Body, one in all and all in one. The Three Persons are described as the one and undivided Trinity; so also the one Body the Church is one and undivided; that is, from the very nature of its one substance, from the very fact of her being "one in many," and, conversely, many in one, she is, both externally and internally, an indivisible unity; for, as the Holy Trinity cannot be divided into separate and independent Gods, so neither can the one Church be severed into many and separate Churches. She is, then, one in many and many in one, and hence she is an indivisible unity.

But how is this unity maintained and preserved? S. Hilary lays down the principles of unity very clearly. He declares in the first instance that the one Church is "not a body made up of a sort of confused mixture of bodies, nor by each of them

being gathered together into an undistinguishable heap and shapeless mass"; that is to say, she is not composed of communities differing in articles of faith and doctrine, or in the cardinal principles of discipline.

S. Hilary next shows what are the essential elements of a real unity; viz. "unity of faith," the "brotherhood of charity"—*i. e.* fellowship or communion, "concord of deeds and wills," "through the gift of that Sacrament which is one in all, are we all one Body." These four elements compose the divine unity. Churches which can exhibit these proofs must necessarily be one Body; for they must all teach the same thing, they must be in union with the one "brotherhood," *i. e.* the undivided episcopate; they must all labour together in "the concord of deeds and wills," and all partake of the Sacrament of unity.

S. Optatus Milevis, A.D. 363.

"You have said that the Church is one, to the exclusion of heretics, but you have not chosen to acknowledge where that Church is. . . . It is for me to state which or where that one Church is; which it is; besides that one [Church] there is none other. . . . You have said that with heretics the marks of the Church cannot be, and you say truly; for we know that the churches of every one of the heretics are prostituted; are without any lawful sacraments; and without the rights of honourable marriage; churches which Christ repudiates as unnecessary, He being the Spouse of one Church; as in the Canticles Himself testifies, who in that He praises one, condemns all others; because, besides the one which is the true Catholic [Church], others are reckoned as being amongst the heretics, though they exist not, agreeably to that which He points out, as has been said, in the Canticles of Canticles, that 'one' is His 'dove,' and that same one

His chosen 'spouse'; the same 'a garden enclosed,' and 'a fountain sealed up'; as none of the heretics either has 'the Keys' which Peter alone received, or the ring with which the 'fountain' is said to be 'sealed up'; nor is there any of them to whom the 'garden' belongs, wherein God plants His shoots. . . . But I wonder what you were at, to join yourselves also to them [*i. e.* the heretics], you who are manifestly schismatics, and yet deny the marks* of the Church, both to heretics and to yourselves who are schismatics. For you have, amongst other things, said that schismatics are like branches cut off from the vine; that, doomed to punishment, they are reserved like dry wood for the fire of hell. But I perceive that you are ignorant that a schism was made by your leader at Carthage. Seek into the origin of these things, and you will find that you have pronounced this sentence against yourselves, when you united heretics with schismatics. For it was not Cæcilianus [of Carthage] that went out [*i. e.* the communion] from your [spiritual] ancestor Majorinus [the rival Bishop of Carthage], but Majorinus from Cæcilianus; neither did Cæcilianus withdraw from the Chair of Peter or of Cyprian, but Majorinus did, whose chair you occupy, which chair, antecedently to Majorinus himself, had no original. And as it is most plainly certain that these things were thus transacted, it evidently appears that you are the heirs of traitors and schismatics."†

This magnificent passage gives the key to all the sayings of the Fathers touching the doctrine of the indivisibility of the Catholic Church. S. Optatus asserts (1) that the Church is one, "besides that one there is no other"; (2) "that the churches of every one of the heretics are prostituted," that is, that they are faithless to God and His Truth; (3) that these schismatic churches possess no

* Dos signifies a gift, or property, or quality, as proceeding from a marriage. The Church is the Bride of Christ, and the dowry consists of certain gifts, as unity, &c., technically called Marks.

† De Schism. Donat., l. i. n. 6–10.

"lawful sacraments": he does not deny that they have sacraments, for apostate bishops and priests cannot lose the character they have received in ordination, but that they are "unlawful," and their use savours not to life but to death; and (4) that they are "without honourable marriage." In fact, S. Optatus considers heretical and schismatic communities as forming no part of the Church, for they are such "which Christ repudiates as unnecessary, He being the Spouse of one Church."

But what is it that constitutes a schism? This Father answers this question when he points out the origin of the Donatist schism. "For it was not Cæcilianus," the Archbishop of Carthage, who went out from [the communion of] your predecessor Majorinus, "Archbishop of the Donatists at Carthage"; but Majorinus from Cæcilianus; neither did Cæcilianus withdraw from the Chair of Peter or of Cyprian, but Majorinus did, whose chair you occupy, which chair, antecedently to Majorinus himself, had no original."

Schism consists in the secession from the communion of (1) the chair of the lawful bishop, and (2) of "the Chair of Peter," *i.e.* the One Chair of authority in the whole Catholic Church. "Cæcilianus [the lawful Bishop] did not withdraw from the Chair of Peter," *i.e.* from the communion of him who sits in "Peter's Chair," nor from the chair "of Cyprian," *i.e.* the see of Carthage united to the Apostolic See, "but Majorinus [the intruding bishop] did," and that circumstance alone constituted the schism; and hence the Donatist

Church, notwithstanding it had validly ordained bishops and priests, possessed no "lawful sacraments," being "without the right of honourable marriage," a Church which Christ repudiated "as unnecessary, He being the Spouse of one Church." It is manifest that, according to S. Optatus, no communities separated from the one Church are in any sense real churches; he regards them as spurious and destitute of any authority whatsoever. It follows, then, that all heretical and schismatical communions are no legitimate churches, but lopped-off branches; and if the true Church is that which is in union with the "Chair of Peter" and with the lawful local chair (*i. e.* the chair in union with the "Chair of Peter"), the Church is an indivisible body; under no circumstance whatever can it be subject to divisions into separate and hostile portions, for the instant a section, be it large or small, disconnects itself with the "Chair of Peter," it ceases to exist, and like a severed branch of a tree or an amputated limb of a body, dies and putrefies.

I shall not at present pursue the argument of S. Optatus touching the authority of the "Chair of Peter," "the first of the marks," because I shall have to treat on that subject more particularly hereafter; but let me draw your attention now to the four magnificent tropes, which exhaustively illustrate this great doctrine—the perfect indivisible unity of the Catholic Church.

S. Optatus says that Christ, in the Canticle of Canticles, "points out that 'one' [Church] is His 'dove,' that same one His chosen 'spouse,' the

same 'a garden enclosed' and 'a fountain sealed up.'" Each of these tropes witnesses for an indivisible unity, for neither of them can possibly be divided so as to form two or more distinct and independent bodies or things, with a perfect and complete organization or entity. Divide a "dove" into several parts, and it of course ceases to be what it was before—a "dove"; in like manner, cut in twain a "spouse," and she ceases to be a bride, she becomes a corpse fit only for the tomb; divide a "garden" into several inclosures, it ceases to be one garden enclosed. The "fountain sealed up" is perhaps the most exhaustive symbol of the idea of an indivisible unity, for a fountain cannot be physically divided at all, as a dove, a spouse, or a garden, though at the expense of extinction of life or existence. A fountain in respect to water is a spring or source, and in regard to other things an original, first principle or first cause. You will allow that a spring, an original, a first principle or first cause, are things which cannot by any possibility be divided so as to form two springs, two sources, two originals, or two first principles or causes of one and the same thing.

God is the fountain, spring, source, first principle, and first cause of everything in heaven and on earth, and in grace and nature. Can God be divided? The king is, under God, the fountain, spring, source, first principle, and first cause of all matters relating to the body-politic of his kingdom. Can the king be divided? He may indeed be expelled, but divided he cannot be; and as long as he reigns he is an indivisible

unity, and likewise the kingdom which is subject to his sceptre. You may as well divide a point in geometry as divide a "fountain" into two or more fountains. As, then, the "fountain" cannot by any possibility be divided, it is a most fitting type of the unity of the Church, which, like the fountain, cannot by any means be broken into two or more separate and independent Churches. Bishops, priests, and their followers may indeed secede and form themselves into rival churches, but as soon as they have consummated their schism they cease to be churches in the Catholic sense of the term; and though, by virtue of the indelibility of holy orders, they have the power of celebrating the sacraments, yet, as this Father justly says, are they without "lawful sacraments," "and without the rights of honourable marriage," whose ministrations "Christ repudiates as unnecessary."

But how is the one indivisible fountain to be distinguished? This Father points to the fountain "sealed up," and to him who alone possesses "the Keys" and "the Ring," by which it is opened or sealed. The "Keys" and the "Ring" are the symbols of jurisdiction, and he who has lawful possession of them is master of the "Fountain sealed up," having power to open and "seal" as he deems proper. I have shown, from the testimony of this great Father, that the Church is as indivisibly one as a "dove," a "spouse," a "garden enclosed," and as a "fountain sealed up," to which no heretical or schismatical communion can possibly have any access.

S. Basil, A.D. 370.

"Adoration is necessary; not that which is out of the Church, but that which is offered in the very Court of God. Invent not, says He, your own 'courts' and synagogues for Me. One is the holy 'Court' of God. The synagogue of the Jews was formerly that 'Court,' but after their sin against Christ their 'house' became 'desolate.' Hence does the Lord also say, 'and other sheep I have which are not of this fold.' When speaking of those that are preordained out of the Gentiles unto salvation, He points out a 'Court' of His own, besides that of the Jews. Wherefore out of that 'holy Court' God is not to be worshipped, but in that Court: lest he that is out of it, or is drawn out of it by those that are without, cease to be in the Lord's 'Court.'"*

He who wrote these words could not have imagined the possibility of the Catholic Church ever being divided into separate independent "courts." There is one place only where God may lawfully be worshipped, that is "the Lord's Court." The "court" during the former dispensation was at Jerusalem, a local city; now it is in the New Jerusalem, a universal city, under the government of Jesus Christ, and those to whom He has committed His jurisdiction. The "court" is a type of an indivisible unity, and this unity consists in its adhesion to the lawful Sovereign and those to whom He has delegated power to act in his name. Wherever the king is, there is his "court"; wherever the king is not, there is not his court. The court cannot be divided into two courts, because the king himself—as king—is an indivisible unity; and it consists of those only

* T. i. in Ps. xxviii. n. 3.

who are privileged to attend the presence. Under this symbolic word S. Basil taught that the Church is indivisibly one, *i. e.* she cannot be divided.

S. Ambrose, A.D. 385.

"The water, at the Lord's command, knew both to gather together, to fear, and to fly. Let us be likened unto this water, and we shall know the one congregation of the Lord, the one Church. Time was that the water here was gathered out of every valley, marsh, and lake. The valley is heresy, is Gentilism, because God is the God of the hills, not of the valleys. In fine, in the Church there is exaltation; in heresy and Gentilism, weeping and mourning. Whence He says, 'He hath set it in the vale of tears.' Out of every valley therefore is the Catholic people gathered. And now the congregations are not many; but here is one congregation, one Church."*

"Where Peter is, there is the Church."†

"They have not Peter's inheritance who have not Peter's Chair."‡

Like S. Basil, S. Ambrose has no idea that the Church could be divided and split up into rival communions. He says that "the congregations are not many; but here is one congregation, one Church." Those who secede from the Catholic Church do not become a congregation of the Lord, but a congregation of the Evil One, for the Church is one. For the Church Catholic is where Peter is, and they who are not in communion with "Peter's Chair" have no "inheritance," because, being aliens, they are "without," as so many Fathers say. The Church, then, according to

* T. i. Hexæm., l. iii. c. i. n. 2, 3.
† *Ib.* in Ps. xl. n. 30.
‡ T. ii. De Pœnit., l. i. c. vii. n. 33.

S. Ambrose, is an indivisible unity, for S. Peter, the type of unity, cannot be divided, and union with him is essential to form a lawful "congregation," which, being aggregated with the universal "congregation," forms one congregation and one Church, undivided and indivisible.

S. Jerome, A.D. 399.

"She—that with a firm root is planted upon the Rock Christ—the Catholic Church, the one dove, she stands the perfect one, and nighest to Him on His right hand; for she has nothing sinister in her; she stands in 'gilded robes,' passing from the words to the sense of the Scripture; and she is filled with every virtue, or, as we have translated it, with a 'diadem of gold.' For she is a Queen, and reigns together with the King; whose 'daughters' we may understand to be the souls of believers in general, and of the choir of virgins in particular."*

The Catholic Church cannot be composed of several independent hostile Churches if she is held to be one—one like the "dove," which cannot be divided; and this oneness is powerfully illustrated by her comparison to a "Queen," who sits on the right hand of the King, clothed in "gilded robes" and crowned with a "diadem of gold." How can a queen be divided? Can a queen be quartered, a portion exhibited in a chief town in the north, a second in the south, a third in the east, and a fourth in the west? Imagine such an absurdity, and it is not by any means less absurd to suppose that the Church in like manner can be divided into as many separate and independent churches. As

* T. i. Ep. lxv. ad Princip., n. 15.

the "Queen" is a being who cannot be divided without destroying her existence, no more can the Church be severed in twain or more.

S. Cyril of Alexandria, A.D. 424.

"Therefore do we say that the mystery of Christ must be celebrated in the Churches of God as in holy tabernacles. . . . 'In one House shall it be eaten, neither shall ye carry forth of the Flesh thereof out of the House.' The many-minded heretics violate this will of God, fixing up for themselves, as they do, another tabernacle, besides that which is truly the holy Tabernacle, and sacrificing the Lamb 'without,' and carrying it forth somewhere to a very great distance from the one House, and dividing the indivisible.* For Christ is one, and perfect in all."†

S. Cyril complains of the heretics setting up rival tabernacles and churches and profaning the Blessed Sacrament by their schismatical oblation; but he holds that these tabernacles are no churches in the true sense of the term, for he describes the Catholic Church as "truly the holy Tabernacle," and those places where they impiously sacrifice the Lamb are, he says, "without," that is, their tabernacles are no portion of the true Tabernacle, the one Church, the "one House," which they madly attempt to divide; that is to say, "dividing the indivisible," which is a sheer impossibility.

* *μερίζοντες τὸν ἀμέριστον*: *i. e.* dividing that which is indivisible; a very strong form of expression, indicating the impossibility of dividing into separate parts that which cannot be divided.

† T. i. De Ador. in Sp. et Ver., l. x. p. 355, edit. Paris, 1638.

2.—THE CHURCH ONE AND INDEFECTIBLE.

If the Church Catholic is indivisibly one, it requires no argument to prove that she must be indefectible, that is to say, that she cannot fail in any essential point of unity; she cannot be overcome by heresies, schisms, or vices: in a word, she is ever, in all ages, perfect, both outwardly and inwardly. Individuals, and even large masses of her priests and people, may err in faith and morals, and even secede from her communion; yet the Church remains as she was before—one, indivisible, and indefectible; even as a body which has a limb torn off, or a tree some of the branches of which have been wrenched by a sudden blast of wind. I have already shown how holy Scripture asserts the principle of indefectibility: I now proceed to submit to you a multitude of passages from the Fathers in support of this great fundamental truth.

S. Ignatius, A.D. 107.

"Do not err, my brethren. Those that corrupt families shall not inherit the Kingdom of God. If, then, those who do thus as respects the flesh have suffered death, how much shall this be the case with any one who corrupts by wicked doctrines the faith of God, for which Jesus Christ was crucified. Such an one becoming defiled shall go away into everlasting fire, and so shall every one that hearkens to him. For this end did the Lord suffer the ointment to be poured upon His Head, that He might breathe incorruption* into His Church."†

---

* ἀφθαρσία is usually employed to express "incorruption." This is its primary meaning; secondarily, "immortality," that is, not subject to corruption. Christ breathed "incorruption into His Church," that is, He made her immaculate, incorruptible, and immortal.

† Ep. ad Ephes., c. xvi. xvii.

S. Ignatius compares the condition of persons who corrupt families with those who attempt to corrupt the faith of God by wicked doctrines, showing that if in the one case they forfeit their salvation, how much more in the other? Families are liable to be corrupted, but not so the Church. Why so? Because Christ, having received the divine unction, "breathed incorruption into His Church"; that is to say, that the principle of a divine life having been infused into the Body of His Church, can never become corrupt, can never become the subject of decay, of heresy, or of vice. Individuals may err and seek to corrupt the Church, but they are instantly expelled, and cease to be of the Church. It will be said, however, that as God breathed into the first man Adam, and he became consequently a living soul, and yet notwithstanding he fell, and together with him the whole human race then in his loins, so may the Church fall, into which Christ had "breathed incorruption." To this it may be replied, that to Adam indefectibility was not promised; on the contrary, the possibility of his fall was assumed, for God said to him, "The day thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die."* Not so in regard to the Church, for He granted to S. Peter a solemn promise or guarantee, saying, "The gates of hell shall not prevail against it";† and again: "I will pray the Father, and He shall give you another Paraclete, that He may abide with you for ever, even the

* Gen. ii. 17. † S. Matt. xvi. 18.

Spirit of Truth."* It is impossible for the Church to fall into heresy and vices, therefore is she ever indefectible.

S. Irenæus, A.D. 178.

". . . The preaching of the Church is everywhere consistent, and continues in an even course, and receives testimony from the prophets, the Apostles, and all disciples, as I have proved, through the first, intermediate, and final period; and through the entire dispensation of God, and that well-grounded system which tends to man's salvation, namely, our faith; which having been received from the Church, we do preserve, and which always, by the Spirit of God, renewing its youth, as if it was a precious deposit in an excellent vessel, causes the vessel itself containing it to renew its youth also. For this gift of God has been entrusted to the Church, as breath was to the first created man, for this purpose, that all the members receiving it may be vivified; and the [means of] communion with Christ has been distributed throughout it, that is the Holy Spirit, the earnest of incorruption, the means of confirming our faith, and the ladder of ascent to God. 'For in the Church,' it is said, 'God hath set Apostles, prophets, teachers,' and all the other means through which the Spirit works; of which all those are not partakers who do not join themselves to the Church, but defraud themselves of life through their perverse opinions and infamous behaviour. For where the Church is, there is the Spirit of God; and where the Spirit of God is, there is the Church, and every kind of grace; but the Spirit is Truth." †

The points to be noted in the above extract are (1) that the Catholic Church, no less than "the precious deposit," is ever "renewing her youth," that is, that she never grows old; that is again, she is not subject to the effects of old age. (2)

* S. John xiv. 16, 17.

† Adv. Hæres., l. iii. c. xxiv. n. 1.

That this gift of God, "the precious deposit," is to the Church as "breath was to the first man." God breathed into man, and he became a living soul, that is, a being endowed with a divine life; so also the Catholic Church, the life of which is that "precious deposit" of truth, without which she would die. (3) That the means of preserving this living principle in the Church is "the Holy Spirit, the earnest of incorruption, the means of confirming our faith, and the ladder of ascent to God." (4) That this Holy Spirit works not outside the Church, but in the Church; for God has set in her "Apostles, prophets, and teachers," and other modes, by which He ever manifests Himself "to those who join themselves to the Church." (5) That "where the Church is, there is the Spirit of God; and where the Spirit of God is, there is the Church, and every kind of grace."

The Catholic Church so endowed can be nothing else but indefectible, for having within her—"the excellent vessel"—"the precious deposit," and also the energizing power and influence of the Holy Ghost, she is impervious to the decaying influences of time, and impenetrable to all the devices of heretics and schismatics. How could it be otherwise, if it is true that "where the Church is, there is the Spirit of God": and again, "where the Spirit of God is, there is the Church." For the "Spirit" and "the Church" are one and inseparable; and if the Holy Ghost be indefectible (which no one will deny), so consequently is the Church.

Clement of Alexandria, A.D. 190.

"An excellent thing the city and the people . . . governed by law, as by the Word, the Church, which is a city on earth impregnable and free from oppression, the divine will on earth as in heaven."*

"If any magistrate prohibit the Greek philosophy it vanishes at once; but though from its very first commencement, both kings and tyrants . . . and a countless multitude were set in hostile array against us, and trying with all their power to cast us out, and have opposed our doctrine, it but flourishes the more; for it perishes not like human doctrine, nor fades away like a feeble gift; for no gift of God is powerless; it endures, incapable of being put down; prophesied of, that it should be persecuted to the end."†

The Church indeed is a most excellent City, governed by law, not human but divine, *i. e.* "by the Word." This City is "impregnable," for no power on earth or in hell can take her by assault. Kings, magistrates, tyrants, and whole peoples have endeavoured with all their power to destroy her, but the more she is assailed, the stronger she becomes; the more her sacred walls are battered by the armies of men and devils, the greater her power of endurance; the more the enemy excels in skill and strategy, the more are they outwitted by her superior generalship, for "no gift of God is powerless"; and as the Catholic Church is endowed with a divine life, and entrusted with the charge of holy doctrine, "she endures," being "incapable of being put down." True, she is ever persecuted in divers modes, but that is the sure sign of her divinity,—the sign ever spoken against, and the certain precursor of

* Strom., l. iv. p. 642, edit. Venet. 1757. † *Ib.* l. vi. p. 827.

her victory over her enemy. Indefectible as regards the decay of age, she is indefectible also with respect to the outer world, being, as this Father asserts, an "impregnable City."

Origen, A.D. 216.

"'Thou art Peter,' and the rest, down to, 'and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.' Which does 'it' refer to,—the 'Rock' upon which Christ built His Church, or 'the Church,' for the phrase is ambiguous? Or is it that they are, as it were, one and the same thing, 'the Rock and the Church'? This, I think, is the real fact, for neither against the 'Rock on which Christ built His Church,' nor against the 'Church, shall the gates of hell prevail.' . . . The Church, as the edifice of Christ, 'who' wisely 'built His House upon the Rock,' is not susceptible of 'the gates of hell,' which, prevailing against every one who is out of the Rock and the Church, have no power against her." *

"Though 'the gates of hell' are many, and almost countless, not one of them shall prevail against 'the Rock,' or against the Church which Christ built upon it."†

According to Origen, the Rock is Peter, on whom the Lord built His Church, and likewise the Church herself which is founded upon that Rock. The Rock, then, is Peter and the Church, against whom he says the gates of hell shall not prevail. But he adds significantly, the gates of hell will prevail against every one "who is out of the Rock and the Church," that is, the Church built on that Rock. Churches and people who have severed themselves from the communion of the one Rock-Church, are the prey of errors and heresies; while that one Communion which has

* T. iii. tom. xii. in Matt. n. 11. † *Ib.*

the Rock for its basis and substance is indefectible against the gates of hell, not one of which, Origen says, "shall prevail against the Rock, or against the Church which Christ built upon it." You see, then, what Christ meant when He said, "The gates of hell shall not prevail against" the Church I have built upon the Rock, *i. e.* Peter.

S. Cyprian, A.D. 248.

"Nor ought it, my dearest brother, to disturb any one who is faithful and mindful of the Gospel, and retains the commands of the Apostle who forewarns us; if, 'in the last days,' certain persons, proud, contumacious, and enemies of God's priests, either depart from the Church or act against the Church, since both the Lord and His Apostles have previously foretold that there should be such. . . . Nevertheless, Peter, upon whom by the same Lord the Church had been built, speaking one for all, and answering with the voice of the Church, says, 'Lord, to whom shall we go? Thou hast the words of eternal life; and we believe and are sure that Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God,' signifying doubtless, and showing, that those who depart from Christ perished by their own fault; yet that the Church which believes in Christ, and holds that which it has once learned, never departs from Him at all, and that those are the Church who remain in the House of God; but that, on the other hand, they are not the plantation planted by God the Father, whom we see not to be established with the stability of wheat, but blown about like chaff by the breath of the enemy scattering them, of whom John also in his Epistle says, 'They went out from us, but they were not of us; for if they had been of us, no doubt they would have continued with us. . . .'"*

Quoting the words of S. Peter, "Lord, to whom shall we go?" &c., S. Cyprian says:—

* Ep. lv. ad Cornel., pp. 82, 83, edit. Paris, 1726.

"Peter speaks there, on whom the Church was to be built, teaching and showing, in the name of the Church, that although a rebellious and arrogant multitude of those who will not hear and obey may depart, yet the Church does not depart from Christ; and they are the Church who are a people united to the priest, and the flock which adheres to its pastor. Whence you ought to know that the bishop is in the Church, and the Church in the bishop; and if any one be not with the bishop, that he is not in the Church, and that those flatter themselves in vain who creep in, not having peace with God's priests, and think that they communicate secretly with some; while the Church, which is Catholic and one, is not cut nor divided, but is indeed connected and bound together by the cement of priests who cohere one with another."*

"And this unity we ought firmly to hold and assert, especially those of us that are bishops who preside in the Church, that we may also prove the episcopate itself to be one and undivided. . . . The episcopate is one, each part of which is held by each for the whole. . . . The Spouse of Christ cannot be adulterous; she is uncorrupted and pure. She knows one home; she guards with chaste modesty the sanctity of one couch. . . . The Lord says, 'I and the Father are one'; and again, it is written of the Father, and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, 'and these three are one.' And does any one believe that this unity, which thus comes from the divine strength and coheres in celestial sacraments, can be divided in the Church, and can be separated by the parting asunder of opposing wills?"†

"Undoubtedly there are bishops made, not by the will of God, but they are such as are made outside of the Church, such as are made contrary to the ordinance and tradition of the Gospel, as the Lord Himself in the twelve prophets asserts, saying, 'They have set up a king for themselves, and not by Me.' And again: 'Their sacrifices are as bread of mourning; all that eat thereof shall be polluted.' And the Holy Spirit also cries by Isaiah, and says, 'Woe unto you children that are deserters. Thus saith the Lord, Ye have taken counsel, but not of Me; and ye have

---

* Ep. lxix. ad Pupian., p. 123.

† De Unitate, pp. 195, 196.

made a covenant, but not of My Spirit, that ye may add sin to sin."*

The important points in S. Cyprian's works touching the doctrine of indefectibility are well worthy our careful consideration. He asserts (1) "that the Church never departs from Christ"; (2) that "those who remain in the House of God are the Church"; (3) that they who depart from Christ, *i. e.* from the Church (for Christ and the Church are one) "are not the plantation of [Christ,]" but are "chaff" scattered by the wind, for "they went out from us," not being "of us"; (4) that notwithstanding that whole multitudes may depart from the Church, yet "the Church does not depart from Christ"; (5) that the Spouse of Christ cannot be "adulterous"; (6) that she cannot become "corrupted"; (7) that she is ever "pure"; (8) that she knows only "one home"; and (9) that "with chaste modesty she guards the sanctity of one couch."

According to S. Cyprian, the Church is ever the same holy, pure, immaculate, incorruptible Spouse of Christ, ever faithful to Him, ever true to the one faith, invariably teaching that doctrine which she received from Christ, knowing no one but Him who alone is the Truth. S. Cyprian held, then, not only the unity and indivisibility of the Church, but likewise her indefectibility, being incapable of corruption by heresy or division by schism. "Does

* Ep. lv. ad Cornel., p. 82. This extract, properly speaking, should have preceded another quoted above from the same epistle. The object of this transposition will be perceived in the argument.

any one," says he, "believe that this unity which thus comes from the divine strength, cohering in celestial sacraments, can be divided in the Church, and can be separated by the parting asunder of opposing wills?" Some of our Anglican friends believe in the possibility of the Church being divided and corrupted, and in the existence of two or more separate Churches unconnected by any external act of sacramental communion, and they oftentimes appeal to that passage in S. Cyprian's epistle to Pupianus, in which he says, "the bishop is in the Church, and the Church in the bishop." But they forget two things: (1) that a bishop, to be the real father of his flock, in the sense that the bishop is in the Church and the Church in the bishop, must be a *lawful* bishop, elected, consecrated, and commissioned by some authority who has power from God to send him; and (2) that he must exercise his episcopate not for himself, not for his own ends, not for the benefit of a sect, not for carrying into effect the will or command of the king, but for the whole episcopate; for S. Cyprian says "the episcopate is one, each part [or diocese, in our modern language] of which is held by each [bishop] for the whole." The "episcopate is one and undivided"; it is, as he says elsewhere, "one brotherhood," and each member labours, in behalf of the entire body, in the place where he is sent. A bishop, then, out of the communion of the "one brotherhood" may indeed be a bishop, but he is outside the Church. Of such S. Cyprian says they are made, "not by the will of God," but "made outside of the Church,"

"contrary to the ordinance and tradition of the Gospel"; and quoting the prophets, he says they are as kings set up by outsiders for themselves, not constituted by the Lord; and hence "their sacrifices are as bread of mourning, and all that eat thereof are polluted."

According, then, to S. Cyprian, the Church is one and indefectible, that is, that the one Episcopate and the one Church are one incorruptible Body, incapable of being overcome by the Evil One, being ever free from heresy or error, and always true and faithful to the Lord, the Bridegroom of the Church, His pure Spouse, who at all times guards with scrupulous care "the sanctity of one couch."

S. Alexander of Alexandria, a.d. 322.

"We also confess one and one only Catholic Apostolic Church, which is always incapable of being overthrown, even though the whole world choose to war with it; and it is triumphant over every most unhallowed revolt of the heterodox; the Master of the Household Himself having made us confident, in that He exclaims, 'Have confidence, I have overcome the world."*

The Church, says this Father, "is incapable of being overthrown, even if the whole world choose to war with it." During the time of this Father the great and deadly heresy of Arianism broke out, denying the divinity of our Lord; and, as you know, it had many friends and followers, and was even supported at times by powerful emperors, and yet the Apostolic Church triumphed. So it has been during the fourteen centuries since, and so it will

* Ep. de Arian. Hæres., Galland., t. iv. p. 450.

be till the end. The Church, then, according to this Father, who is in perfect accord with all other great doctors of the Church, is so indefectible in her external walls and in her internal citadel, that she cannot be overthrown, even if all the powers of the world and hell were leagued against her.

Eusebius, a.d. 325.

"The Saviour prophesied that His doctrine would be preached over the whole world, wherever man was, as a testimony to all nations; and by a divine foreknowledge He foretold that the Church too, which during the years of His sojourning amongst men, was not seen nor established, should be invincible, incapable of overthrow, and never overcome by death, but should, according to His declaration, stand and continue immovable, as being by His power firmly established and imbedded on a 'Rock' that could not be moved nor broken. . . . For the fame of His Gospel has filled every country which the sun illumines; it has traversed all nations; and even now, in accordance with His words, the preaching concerning Him is more widely diffused and increased: and His Church, of which He prophesied by name, has stood, and has struck deep her roots; and by the prayers of men holy and beloved of God, she has been exalted to the very heavens, and daily is more glorified, scattering everywhere the intellectual and divine Light of that holiness which He evangelized, is nowise overcome, nor does she in anything yield to her enemies, or even to the gates of death; and this because of one word which he uttered, saying, 'I will build My Church upon a Rock, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.'"*

The Church, according to Eusebius, is firmly established, and is "invincible" and "incapable of overthrow," because she was founded upon the "immovable" "Rock," against which the gates of hell shall not prevail.

* Præp. Evangel., l. i. c. iii. p. 7, edit. Paris, 1628.

S. Athanasius, A.D. 362.

"'Unless the Lord build the house and keep the city, in vain do the labourers build and the watchmen guard.' Therefore is the Jewish system destroyed, for it was a shadow; but that of the Church is firmly established, 'for she is built upon the Rock, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.'"*

"'And His throne as the sun before Me': understand by the 'throne' of Christ, the Church, for in it He rests. The Church of Christ, then, he says, shall be refulgent, and shall enlighten all under heaven, and be abiding as the sun and the moon. For this passage says: 'His throne as the sun before Me, and as the moon perfect for ever, and a faithful witness in heaven.'"†

I have already observed how the Church was afflicted in the time of S. Alexander of Alexandria by the errors of Arianism. Satan artfully, and for the moment with some success, nearly accomplished the overthrow of the Catholic Church. Eminent bishops fell into the snare; large numbers of priests were led astray and became apostate. The Church was as it were shaken to her foundation; the Rock on which she is built trembled, and many expected to witness her fall, and the falsification of our Lord's solemn guarantee, "the gates of hell shall not prevail."

The Church of God has never since been so terribly assaulted as she was in the time of this illustrious Father. The Oriental schism, and the fall of England from the faith, and certain parts of North Europe, were but slight earthquakes compared to this gigantic and demoniacal effort

* T. i. Orat. iv. contr. Arian., n. 34.

† T. i. Expos. in Ps., pt. ii. p. 1160, edit. 1698.

of hell to destroy the great universal Empire-Church. In the midst of this furious diabolical storm S. Athanasius was observed as the man of the hour, raised up by God to defend the citadel of truth, and by his great sanctity, his profound learning, and his marvellous eloquence, he succeeded in rolling back the infernal wave of apostasy to the place whence it originated, and the Empire-Church conquered.

In no period of her history did she exhibit her enormous strength, her marvellous power, and her invincible indefectibility as she did at that time. The Church was then like a huge mainspring of steel coiled up in circular folds, which, when pressed against by external forces, yields indeed, it may be to its very centre, but instantly recoils, and with gigantic and irresistible might scatters them to the four winds, crushing them by her omnipotence to powder; for you remember what Christ said: "On whomsoever [the Stone] shall fall, it will grind him to powder."

S. Athanasius declares that "the Church is firmly established," because it is built upon the Rock, and cannot be destroyed by the gates of hell; and likewise, because it is a House built not by man, but by the Lord. In his comment on Psalm lxxxviii. 38, he asserts that the "Throne" is the Church where sits our divine Lord: from whence the Light will shine and illumine the whole earth; and inasmuch as the Throne is described by the Psalmist to be as the sun before the Lord, so will the Church endure in perfection for ever, even as the sun and moon; for he adds, "this passage says so, 'His

Throne as the sun before Me, and as the moon perfect for ever, and a faithful witness in heaven.'" The Church, as witnessed by this great champion of the faith, is as indefectible as the sun and the moon, proof against the action of time, unaffected by the winds and storms, and the multitudes of phenomena that ever and anon occur in the regions above.

S. Epiphanius, A.D. 385.

"Such as these have no power against the Ark; for holy Noah received a commission, according to the word of the Lord, to secure it; as the Lord said unto him, 'Thou shalt pitch it within and without'; that he might thereby point out the semblance of the Holy House of God, which has that efficacy of pitch which repels pernicious and destructive and serpent-like doctrines. For where the smell of pitch is, there the snake is unable to remain."*

"The holy faith of God being from the beginning, and ever venerable with age, though it never grows old, always exists, and its foundations are ever firm; it always subsists, having a Lord that is unlimited by time."†

"This was befitting, that first of the Apostles, that firm 'Rock,' upon which 'the Church' of God was 'built,' and 'the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.' 'The gates of hell' are heresies and heresiarchs.'"‡

Under the type of "pitch" is shown by this Father the indefectibility of the Church, against which Satan is powerless to inflict any mortal wound. S. Epiphanius also asserts that the holy faith "is ever venerable with age," for it is co-eternal with God Himself; and further, "it never grows

* T. i. Adv. Hæres. (51), l. ii. tom. i. n. 11.
† *Ib.* (76), l. iii. tom. i. n. 1.
‡ T. ii. Ancoratus, n. 9.

old," because it is unaffected by time, enjoying a never-ceasing present, for the Church came from God, and like Him, she knows no period of time. Doubtless there was a time when the Rock was founded upon earth on which the Church is built, but that Rock, once planted, cannot be uprooted, for it is firmly embedded in the ground, and the "gates of hell," *i. e.* "heresies and heresiarchs," "shall not prevail against it." The Catholic Church knows no age, and she is impervious to corruption, having "pitch" "within" and "without," and unassailable by the enemy.

S. Ambrose, A.D. 385.

"'Zabulon,' it is said, 'shall dwell near the sea,' that himself exempt from danger, he may see the shipwrecks of others, and behold others tossed about in the sea of this world, and carried about by every wind of doctrine, whilst he continues himself immovable in the root of faith, even as the most holy Church is rooted and founded in faith, beholding the storm-tossed heretics and the shipwrecked Jews, because they have repudiated their former pilot. By the waves therefore is her dwelling-place, but by the waves she is not shaken; prepared rather to afford help, than herself obnoxious to danger: so that if there be any who, driven by the fierce tempests, wish to flee to harbour, the Church, as a harbour of safety, may be at hand, and with outstretched arms invites the imperilled unto her bosom of rest, showing them a place that is a safe haven. The Churches, therefore, are in this world placed for the endangered, like maritime harbours scattered along the coast; proclaiming that a place of refuge has been prepared for believers, whither they may withdraw their storm-tossed vessels."*

Do not imagine that the word "Churches"

* T. i. De Bened. Patr., c. v. n. 27.

would include any sort of church, for in the days of S. Ambrose there was no such thing as a non-episcopal church or community. The schismatics had bishops no less than the orthodox, and no one would assert that an heretical or schismatical community was regarded by S. Ambrose as "a harbour of safety" for believers. No, it was the one Catholic Church under her Catholic bishops, stationed everywhere, who were the appointed pilots to guide all who sought rest from the storm and tempest in the "safe haven" of peace. This Church, S. Ambrose declares, is "immovable," not shaken by the roaring waves of error, and is so "obnoxious to danger" as to be able to afford help to all in distress.

"The Church," he says in another treatise, "too, hath her seasons of persecution and of peace. For she seems to wane like the moon, but she fails not. She may be overcast with clouds, but fail she cannot; she is indeed lessened by the falling away of individuals in the time of persecution, that she may fill up her orb by the confession of her martyrs; and that, made resplendent by the victorious shedding of their blood for Christ, she may shed more brightly the light of her devotion and faith over the whole world. For the moon suffers a diminution of light, not of substance, when, in her monthly changes, she seems to quench her light, that she may borrow from the sun."*

"The Church is buffeted, but is not overwhelmed by the waves of wordly cares; she is stricken, but she is not weakened, being easily able to subdue and calm down the agitation of the waves, as the rebellion of the passions of the body. She looks on, herself free and exempt from danger, whilst others are shipwrecked, always prepared to have Christ shine upon her, and to derive gladness from His Light."†

---

* T. i. Hexæm., l. iv. c. iii. n. 7.

† *Ib.* De Abraham, l. ii. c. iii. n. 11.

The moon is indeed a beautiful symbol of the Church, of her continual risings and falls, not indeed as respects her integrity, but in the apparent variations of her lustre. In the times of persecution, when the blood of her martyrs bedews the ground, she seems to dwindle away, but only to arise stronger than before. By the wholesale flowing of her blood during the first three centuries of her existence, she conquered the heathen world and overthrew the Roman empire. When heresies prevail in the world, when schisms seem to tear her in pieces, and when divisions afflict her soul, her Light appears to become dim, and even apparently extinguished; but soon, like the silvery moon, she is seen to rise in the East, sailing on the clouds, tinging them with her effulgent beams, and then ascending to her exaltation, she shines resplendent all over the earth, drawing towards herself the upturned gaze of all, gently forcing all to admire her beauty, and even to follow with their eyes her onward course.

But though it is true that the Church, like the moon at various times, wanes, and sometimes even ceases to shine, on account of the wickedness of man, yet "she fails not": although she be frequently overcast with the clouds of iniquity, yet "fail she cannot": and though she is sometimes lessened by the falling away of multitudes of heretics and schismatics who once adorned her, yet her orb "is ever made resplendent" by the confession of her martyrs: and though for a moment she may "suffer a diminution of her light," yet her "substance" ever remains in per-

fect integrity. She may indeed be "buffeted," but she is never "overwhelmed": she may be "stricken," but she "is not weakened": in the plenitude of her irresistible power, and in the fulness of her authority she regards "herself free and exempt from danger." Oh that outsiders would but apply to themselves the following beautiful admonition: "Thy rock is faith, the foundation of the Church is faith. If thou be a rock, thou wilt be in the Church, because the Church is upon the Rock. If thou be in the Church, the 'gates of hell' shall not prevail against thee. 'The gates of hell' are the gates of death, but the gates of death cannot be the gates of the Church."*

S. Jerome, A.D. 399.

Commenting on Isaiah iv. 5, 6, he says:

"We refer all this to the first advent of Christ, concerning whom we also read in the Psalms, 'He hath protected Me in the secret place of His Tabernacle, He has exalted Me upon a Rock.' Upon that Rock the Church being built, is not shaken by any tempest, nor is overthrown by any wind or hurricane."†

"'Look upon Sion, the City of our solemnity!' behold the Church of Christ, wherein there is a true solemnity. 'Thine eyes shall see a vision of peace' and unhoped-for treasures, 'which eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither have they entered into the heart of man, and a Tabernacle that cannot be removed.' For the former tabernacle which the Jewish people had was removed and taken away, 'neither shall the nails thereof ever be moved, and all the cords thereof shall be firm'; so that the Lord shall dwell therein: a place of all the rivers and streams through which none

* T. i. Expos. in Luc., i. vi. n. 98.

† T. iv. in Isai., c. iv.

of the adverse party shall be able to sail, nor the 'great galley,' which signifies the devil, shall be able to pass through it, because the Lord Himself is our Judge and our Prince, our King and our Saviour, and under His protection we shall not fear the snares of any one."*

"Hence," commenting on Amos, he says, "we may understand that even to the end of the world the Church may indeed be shaken by persecutions, but never can be overthrown; be tried, not conquered. And this will be, because the Lord God Almighty has promised He will effect this; and His promise is the law of nature."†

S. Jerome, following the footsteps of all the Fathers,—both his contemporaries and predecessors,—affirms clearly and tersely that the Church cannot be overthrown by any tempest, no, not even by any hurricane; that is, that the assaults of heresiarchs, heretics, and schismatics, and their blasphemous doctrines cannot by any means affect her. She may be "shaken by persecution," but she "can never be overthrown," and tried by the fire of adversity, but she cannot be "conquered," for she is impregnable against the enemy and invincible to the attacks of the foe. Not even the great "galley" of the devil can sail upon her waters. Surely it cannot be denied that S. Jerome's testimony is extremely clear and explicit.

S. Chrysostom, A.D. 387.

"[Christ's] prophecies were of two kinds, one to be accomplished in this world, and the other after its consummation; and one establishes and demonstrates with great completeness the truth

---

* T. iv. in Isai., l. x. c. xxxiii.

† T. vi. in Amos, l. iii. c. ix.

of the other. I will give an example, for what has been said is obscure, and therefore will I try to make it plainer. There were twelve disciples who followed Him, but of the matter of the Church no one had at that time formed any idea—nay, no one knew anything of her name. . . . What, then, did He say and prophesy, when well-nigh the whole world was held in godlessness? 'Upon this Rock I will build My Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.' Examine the declaration as you please, and you will see its resplendent truth. For in sooth, it is not alone wonderful that He built her throughout the universe, but that He made her also invincible, though assailed by so great conflicts. 'For the gates of hell' are dangers that lead down to hell. . . . Seest thou the force of the prophecy, 'and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it'? From these have faith as regards the future, and that no one will prevail against it. For if, when [the Church] consisted of but a few persons; when she seemed to be a mere matter of novelty; when the doctrine was just planted; when such were the conflicts, and so dread the strifes enkindled on every side, they prevailed not, they overcame not, much more now that she has taken possession of the whole world, and every place, both mountains and valleys, . . . yea, sooner shall earth and heaven pass away, than any word or prophecy of His be proved false . . . 'heaven and earth,' . . . and with good cause, for they are not words, but God's words, effective of deeds. . . . Come now, let us take in hand another prophecy, which shines brighter than the sun, and is clearer than its rays, which lies under the observation of all men, and which stretches out itself into all future generations, as does also the preceding prophecy. For of this nature are the greater part of His prophecies. They are not limited to a brief period, nor are they completed in one generation, but for all men, as well those who now are, and those who are next to come, for those after them, and again those who shall follow, and so on for all the successions of men even to the consummation, do they [the prophecies] furnish means of ascertaining the force of their inherent truth, even as does the preceding prophecy. Yea, for the day it was spoken, 'even to the consummation of the world,' has [the Church] remained firm and unshaken, flourishing, resplendent, gaining power day by day, accumulating, acquiring fresh force, enabling all those

who have lived from that day, even unto those who shall be until the coming of Christ, to reap the greatest advantages from her, and to derive thence unspeakable aid. For our predecessors and theirs, and theirs again, well knew her power, as they beheld the contests excited against her, and the dangers and troubles, the tumults, the waves, the storms; but beholding her still not overwhelmed, not vanquished, not overcome, not extinguished, but flourishing, increasing, raised to a mightier elevation. . . . Seest thou how what He built, no one has destroyed; and what He did destroy [viz. the temple of Jerusalem], no one shall build up? He built the Church, and no one could destroy her; He destroyed the temple, and no one is able to build it again."*

The above extract affords us valuable evidence to this fact, that the prophetic promise which the Lord made to S. Peter and the Apostles, that the "gates of hell shall not prevail against" the Church, and that He would Himself "be present" all days, "until the consummation of the world," were not made to the Apostles and their immediate successors only, nor to theirs again and so on, but to every generation of the Church, even until the last day. There are many who believe that Christ's promises respecting His Church were personal to S. Peter and the Apostles, not including their successors till the end of time. S. Chrysostom shows clearly enough that they were made for all time, even till the end. From them we draw these conclusions: first, that Christ having erected a Living Rock on which to build His Church, that Rock remains somewhere to this day, performing the same functions now that it did in S. Peter's time; secondly, that the solemn intima-

* T. i. Contr. Jud. et Gent. quod Christus sit Deus, n. 12–16.

tion that the "gates of hell should not prevail against" the Church was assured to all till the consummation; and the sacred promise, "behold I am with you all days until the consummation of the world," was addressed, not to the Twelve only, but in them to all future apostles, bishops, priests, and other ministers, and to all the faithful, their subjects, for ever. It follows, therefore, that S. Chrysostom held the Church to be indefectible in the time of the Apostles, during the ages preceding him, and that she would continue indefectible till the end of the world. The following extracts are strong testimonies for the indefectibility of the Church:—

"There is nothing equal to the Church. Tell me not of walls and arms: for walls grow old with time; but the Church never grows old; walls barbarians destroy, but the Church not even demons can overcome. . . . Such is the mightiness of the Church: warred against, she conquers; devised against, she overcomes; assailed with insult, she is made more resplendent; she receives wounds, but sinks not beneath the ulcer; agitated by the waves, she is not submerged; tempest-tossed, but she suffers no shipwreck; wrestles, but is not overthrown; she fights as a pugilist, but is not beaten. Why has He thus permitted the contest? That she may exhibit a more glorious trophy."*

Again:—

"Withdraw not from the Church, for nothing is stronger than the Church. Thy hope, the Church; thy salvation, the Church; thy refuge, the Church. She is higher than heaven, than earth she is more extended. Never does she grow old, but her age is ever vigorous. For this cause, the Scripture showing her firmness and immovableness, calls her a 'mountain'; her incorrupti-

* T. iii. De Capto Eutropio, n. 1.

bility, calls her a 'virgin'; her magnificence, calls her a 'queen'; that connection she has with God, calls her a 'daughter.'"*

"Nothing, O man, is more powerful than the Church. Give up thy conflict with her, if thou wouldst not have thy power destroyed: wage not war against Heaven. If thou war against man, thou wilt either conquer or be conquered; but if thou war against the Church, it is impossible for thee to conquer; for God is stronger than all men. 'Do we provoke the Lord to jealousy? Are we stronger than He?' God has rooted [her], who attempts to shake [her]? . . . The Church is stronger than heaven; 'heaven and earth shall pass away, but My words shall not pass away.' What words? 'Thou art Peter, and upon this Rock I will build My Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.' If thou believe not the words, believe the facts. How many tyrants would fain have overcome the Church? . . . and they prevailed not. Where are those that warred against her? They are unnamed; they are buried in oblivion. But where is the Church? She shines brighter than the sun. They are quenched; she is immortal. If when the Christians were few in number, they were not conquered, now that the world is full of true religion, how wilt thou be able to conquer? 'Heaven and earth shall pass away,' &c.; and very justly, for the Church is dearer to God than is Heaven."†

Observe these points: (1) "The Church never grows old." (2) She is ever young, "ever vigorous." Like her Lord, she is "the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever." S. Chrysostom then expatiates upon the enormous strength and power of the Church. No king or potentate is equal to her in power, no, not even all the powers on earth combined; "she is stronger than all men," and is a match for Satan and the whole of his infernal bands. How many kings have endeavoured to overthrow

* T. iii. De Capto Eutropio, n. 6.

† *Ib.* Hom. Anteq. iret in exsilium, n. 1, 2.

the Church. The pagan emperors did their best to exterminate her, and they were annihilated. The Arians tried with all their might to foment anti-Christian errors in the Church, for which object they seized many of the principal sees, but in vain. Julian the Apostate brought to bear the whole weight of the Roman empire, but equally in vain. Kings and emperors of the middle ages strove to denude her of her prerogatives, but without effect. Modern sovereigns and states have done their best, like their predecessors, to ruin the Church. Have they succeeded or will they succeed? "For I will rise up against them, saith the Lord of Hosts, and cut off from Babylon [*i. e.* the secular world-power] the name, and remnant. . . . I will also make it a possession for the bittern, and pools of water: and I will sweep it with the besom of destruction, saith the Lord of Hosts."* "Nothing, O man," says this Father, "is more powerful than the Church. Give up thy conflict with her, if thou wouldest not have thy power destroyed: wage not war against heaven." Verily, the Church is impregnable and invincible.

S. Chrysostom is equally clear respecting the indefectibility of the Church in the matter of dogma. Commenting on "the mountain of the Lord" in Isaiah ii., on the words, "In the last days," &c., he says, "He also designates the Church 'a mountain,' and her dogmas impregnable. For even as though one should oppose against mountains countless troops of soldiers,

* Isai. xiv. 22, 23.

drawing their bows, hurling their spears, and bringing up machines, they will not be able to harm them, but will be withdrawn after having exhausted their own strength; even so all they who have fought against the Church have not shaken her, but, having worn out their own strength, have been put to shame, scattered when they struck at her, weakened by hurling their weapons at her, and in their activity vanquished by those who remained passive. For what is marvellous in the Church is, not that she conquered, but also that she conquered in the way she did. . . . Therefore did he call her a 'mountain' . . . the firmness, the immovableness, the loftiness, the invincibleness of the Church did he indicate by that appellation, 'mountain.'"*

Surely I need add no more comments. It is plain that this great Father and doctor, the golden-mouthed Chrysostom, believed the Church to be immaculate and incorrupt, incapable of being overthrown, and invincible against all her enemies;—for she is "stronger than heaven"; and hence all the subtleties of the devil, and of heretics and false philosophers, are powerless to deceive her and lead her astray; and hence, if all the powers of earth were to combine to destroy the Church, every one of them would be ground to powder by that Stone, despised indeed by the builders, but which has become the Corner-Stone of the four-square city.

* *Ib.* t. vi. Com. in Isai., c. ii. n. 2.

S. Augustine, A.D. 400.

Commenting on the words, "In thy tabernacle I will dwell for ever," he says:—

"As not for a brief period was the Church to exist on this earth, but the Church will be here until the end of the world, therefore does he say, 'I shall dwell in thy Tabernacle for ever.' . . . The Church shall not be conquered; shall not be rooted out; nor give way before any trials whatever, till the end of this world shall come."*

"There follows [in the Creed] after the commemoration of the Trinity, 'the Holy Church.' God and His Temple have been shown you. 'For the Temple of God is holy,' says the Apostle, 'which ye are.' This is the Holy Church: the one Church, the true Church, the Catholic Church, which fights against all heresies. She may fight, but cannot be defeated. All heresies have gone out from her like useless branches cut off from the vine; but she remains in her own root, in her own vine, in her own charity. 'The gates of hell' shall not conquer her."†

Like all preceding Fathers, without exception, this great Doctor believed the Church to be indefectible on all points.

S. Cyril of Alexandria, A.D. 424.

"For the City of God is the Church, of which blessed David has made mention, saying, 'Glorious things are said of thee, O City of God! for she is rich, and is adorned with gifts from on high, even from heaven, and has a solid foundation upon what is firm, both a foundation and a permanency'; for, according to the Saviour's words, 'The gates of hell shall not prevail against it.'"‡

"But in this way does He build the Church, and effect for her that she shall be immovable, Christ protecting her as with a shield,

---

* T. iv. Enarr. in Ps. lx. n. 6.

† *Ib.* De Symbol. ad Catech., n. 14.

‡ T. i. l. x. De Ador. in sp. et ver. p. 332.

and granting unto her to be incapable of being moved, for 'the gates of hell shall not prevail against her.'" *

This Father affirms that the Church possesses "a solid foundation and a permanency" which renders her immovable and "incapable of being moved."

Holy Scripture and the Tradition of the Primitive Church attest that the Church was founded upon the Rock by our Lord, accompanied with a solemn promise that the gates of hell should never prevail against that Church founded upon that Rock; and further, that the Church should always be protected by the Holy Spirit, and by our Lord Himself, who is present in His Church "all days, even to the consummation," so that it is an impossibility for the Church at any time to be overcome by the assaults of men and of the evil powers. The Holy Fathers are very clear on this point, as you must have seen: they teach that the Church founded upon the Rock is incorrupt and incorruptible, impregnable to the attacks of the enemy; invincible, for no enemy can conquer her; her strength and power so great that hell has no power against her; so massive and so immovable that nothing can avail to draw her aside from the royal road laid down by Christ for her to follow; so powerful is she, so incapable of overthrow, that no emperor, or king, or tyrant can prevail against her, her doctrine and discipline; and what wonder, for she "is stronger

* Com. in Isai. l. v. t. ii.

than heaven" itself, so that she possesses all the power of her Lord and Master.

She is in every age young, time having no effect on her; decay and senility are unknown to her, for, like her Spouse, she is "the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever"; her bulwarks are as smooth and fresh as the day that God erected them; her walls still shine like burnished gold, her gates retain their pearl-like purity; and the jasper, the sapphire, the emerald, the amethyst, and other precious stones ever glitter in the splendour of their beauty. The Light that is within her at all times shines with luminous splendour, enlightening the world with her glorious Truth.

Yes, the Church is ever young, ever fresh, and ever beautiful to behold, for she is the Spouse of Christ, the incorrupt and incorruptible Bride, who knows no other than Christ, her Lord and High-priest. She is that "Church of the living God"* described by S. Paul as "not having spot or wrinkle, or any such thing," but is always "holy and without blemish."† True, many rebel against her, and many desert her courts, but she remains what she was before, for "they rend themselves, not the Church." The Holy Fathers teach emphatically that the Church is indefectible in regard to her structure, her organism, her doctrine, her discipline, and her worship; and is so omnipotent that no power in heaven above, on earth below, or in hell beneath, can avail against her, because she is founded upon that Rock which Christ planted

* 1 Tim. iii. 15. † Ephes. v. 27.

in the middle of the earth, and pledged His most solemn word, saying that "the gates of hell shall not prevail against" this My Church founded upon the massive and immovable Rock, which, by virtue of the strength and power which I have implanted in it, shall at all times be an impregnable fortress and her denizens an invincible host.

CHAPTER IV.

INFALLIBILITY.

If the Catholic Church be one Body—"one and sole"—as an ancient Father said; or (as it were) a "Person," as S. Augustine asserted; if she be so one that she is indivisible, *i.e.* that she cannot be divided into several independent parts; and if so indefectible against time that she is in every age of the world young, fresh, and vigorous, and indefectible against the assaults of heretics and schismatics, and the crafty insinuations of false philosophers, then it is self-evident, that on all points of faith and morals she must be infallible. I say self-evident, because if she were not infallible, she could never have retained her one-ness, her indivisibility, and her indefectibility, in which case she would have become divided and subdivided into as many independent churches as there are opinions; and as a consequence, truth and morality would be swamped by heresy and vice.

But it has been proved from Scripture and Tradition that the Church is absolutely one, indivisible and indefectible, and therefore of necessity she must be infallible. In point of fact, these prerogatives demonstratively prove each other: for if the Church be one, she must be indivisible, indefectible, and infallible; if indivisible, she can

never fail to be one, indefectible and infallible; if indefectible, her unity, indivisibility, and infallibility cannot be impeached; and finally, if she be infallible, she must of necessity be always one, indivisible, and indefectible. I now proceed to present to you the proofs for the doctrine of the Church's infallibility and incorruptibility. The Scripture proofs and arguments I have already published in the Introductory Epistle to my former work on "The Evidence of the Papacy," and with your permission I shall here reproduce them.

Holy Scripture informs us that during our Lord's visible Presence in the Church which He had constituted, He was her infallible Paraclete, *i. e.* her Teacher, Guide, and Counsellor, in all that appertained to truth and practice. For three years S. Peter and the Apostles were under His personal training; and after His resurrection, S. Luke informs us of all that occurred during those forty days He sojourned on earth, "Until the day in which He was taken up, after that He through the Holy Ghost, had given commandments unto the Apostles whom He had chosen: to whom also He showed Himself alive after His passion by many infallible proofs, being seen of them forty days, and speaking of the things pertaining to the Kingdom of God."* And just before His Ascension He addressed His Apostles, saying, "Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations . . . . teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded

* Acts i. 2, 3.

you: and lo, I am with you all days, even unto the end of the world." * From the time, then, Christ commenced His ministry till the last moment of His visible residence on earth, the Church and Kingdom He had instituted possessed an infallible Teacher, Guide, and Counsellor.

The question which immediately occurs to one's mind now is this: did our Lord make any provision for continuing this infallibility after His Ascension? Was the infant Church, which was under a personal, infallible Teacher and Guide, intended, as soon as Christ and His Apostles had departed from this world, to be left entirely to her own resources, to be the prey and sport of speculators and infidels, without any such supernatural assistance as would be sufficient to preserve her from error and apostasy? Was she, who had been under the personal supervision of her Divine Founder, to be left without a substitute of equal authority and equal infallibility? Reason would, I think, assure us that this would be impossible; but thanks be to God, Holy Scripture determines this for us, as fully and as satisfactorily as possible.

Towards the close of our Blessed Lord's ministry, He startled His hearers and the Apostles by saying: "Little children, yet a little while I am with you. Ye shall seek Me: and as I said unto the Jews, Whither I go, ye cannot come; so now I say to you." Simon Peter immediately replied, "Lord, whither goest Thou?" Jesus answered him, "Whither I go, thou canst not follow Me now;

* S. Matt. xxviii. 19, 20.

but thou shalt follow Me afterwards."* This departure of Christ, which He announced, probably referred only to His temporary absence in hades; but He soon after began to prepare His Apostles for His final departure from this earth. He commenced by saying, "Let not your heart be troubled: ye believe in God, believe also in Me. In My Father's house are many mansions: if it were not so, I would have told you." He here raises the hearts of His Apostles, strengthening their faith in Himself, and unfolds to their gaze the glorious mansions in heaven. Having thus prepared them, He says abruptly, "I go to prepare a place for you. And if I go and prepare a place for you, I will come again, and receive you unto Myself: that where I am there ye may be also; and whither I go ye know, and the way ye know."† One may well imagine the alarm the Apostles felt when they heard these startling words, "I go."

S. Peter was probably aware what was about to happen, for Jesus had announced His intention not long before to him; and it is not unlikely that he, to whom was revealed the Divinity of Christ, might have known more than his brother Apostles. At any rate he was silent. After this, and after enforcing the duty of faith in Himself, Christ announces His gracious intention of supplying a Substitute, equal in all respects to Himself—in dignity, in knowledge, and in power—who should be for the future the Teacher, the Guide, and the Counsellor of the Church, for ever. "And I will

* S. John xiii. 33–36. † *Ib.* xiv. 1–4.

pray the Father, and He shall give you another Comforter (or Paraclete), that He may abide with you for ever; even the Spirit of Truth; whom the world cannot receive, because it seeth Him not, neither knoweth Him: but ye know Him; for He dwelleth with you, and shall be in you. I will not leave you comfortless (or rather, orphans); I will come to you."* Again He repeats the afflicting words, "Yet a little while, and the world seeth Me no more"; with a view, apparently, of impressing on the minds of His Apostles the reality of what was about to happen, and yet to comfort them by adding, "But ye see me: because I live, ye shall live also. At that day ye shall know that I am in My Father, and ye in Me, and I in you."† Then He recurs to his promise: "But the Comforter" (or Paraclete), "which is the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in My name, He shall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have said unto you." Again He affectingly reverts to His approaching departure; but now He braces up the souls of His Apostles: "If ye loved Me, ye would rejoice, because I said, I go unto the Father: for My Father is greater than I." And further He encourages them, saying, "And now I have told you before it come to pass, that, when it is come to pass, ye might believe."‡

Still the Apostles sorrowed, as well they might, notwithstanding the tender consolations of their Lord and Master. He then affectionately addressed

* S. John xiv. 16–18. † *Ib.* 19, 20.
‡ *Ib.* 26–29.

them the third time on this subject: "But because I have said these things unto you, sorrow hath filled your heart. Nevertheless I tell you the truth; it is expedient for you that I go away: for if I go not away, the Comforter" (*i.e.* the Paraclete) "will not come unto you; but if I depart, I will send Him unto you. And when He is come, He will reprove (or convince) the world of sin, and of righteousness, and of judgment: of sin, because they believe not on Me; of righteousness, because I go to My Father, and ye see Me no more; of judgment, because the prince of this world is judged. I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now. Howbeit when He, the Spirit of Truth, is come, He will guide you into all truth: for He shall not speak of Himself; but whatsoever He shall hear, that shall He speak: and He will show you things to come. He shall glorify Me; for He shall receive of Mine, and shall show it unto you."* Christ again reminds His Apostles of His approaching departure, evidently knowing that they could not realize to themselves that He would really leave them. There are no incidents in Holy Scripture so pathetic as this. Our Lord and the Apostles loved each other with a love past comprehension—with love so intense that there are no words to give it adequate description; He loved them with all the power of spirit, soul, and body, but, more than that, He loved them with a Divine love, for He was very God. Their love was, if I may say so with reverence, equal to His—*i. e.* in

* S. John xvi. 6–14.

their degree they loved with as much fervour; they loved Him fervently and passionately. Great, indeed, must have been their affliction and heart-rending sorrow when they heard He was about to leave them. Oh, it must have been a most terrible sorrow: so great that their minds were, so to say, stunned, for they could not understand what He meant, and they would not believe what He said—nay, they could not, so great was the depth of their affliction. But we are indebted to this sorrow of the Apostles, for it drew out from our dear Lord His most gracious and sacred intentions respecting His Church; for through this grief we learn all about that Divine Substitute He was about to send immediately on His departure to the right hand of the Father.

Let us now carefully realize who this Substitute was, and the nature of the mission He was to execute during the absence of the Lord Jesus Christ. It is plainly stated that He who should come would be the Holy Ghost, the third Person of the Holy and Undivided Trinity. He was to come, not as an influence, but as a Person, to dwell with the Church as personally as Christ did before His Ascension, the only difference consisting in His not being visible to us, inasmuch as He has never assumed a body, though at the baptism of Christ He was manifested under the form or shape of a "dove," and on His descent on the Apostles and disciples under the sign of "cloven tongues like as of fire." That His presence was Personal is evident from His mode of operation; for He spoke, on different occasions, audibly to Apostles and Pro-

phets: for example, "As they ministered to the Lord, and fasted, the Holy Ghost said, Separate Me Barnabas and Saul for the work whereunto I have called them."* "And were forbidden of the Holy Ghost to preach the word in Asia."† And again, after the Council of Jerusalem had decided the circumcision case, the Apostles and Elders, in their Synodical Epistle, say, "For it seemed good to the Holy Ghost, and to us," &c.‡

These expressions clearly indicate that the Holy Ghost was present in very Person, teaching, guiding, and counselling, as Christ had done before His departure. This point is of greater importance than it seems at first sight; for, were He present merely influentially by grace, it would by no means fulfil the Lord's promise of sending some one to take His place in the Church, as His Divine Substitute, by whose personal supervision His Church would be taught all that she ought to know, and be guided in all things she was to do, even to the convincing "the world of sin, of righteousness, and of judgment." For what is the exact meaning of the word Paraclete, translated in the English Authorized Version as Comforter? It signifies literally a legal assistant, an advocate, or intercessor. This is what our Lord was to His Church: He was her Advocate—*i. e.* He represented her, pleading her cause—and her Intercessor, inasmuch as He prayed for her and obtained benefits for her; among them, the gift of the Holy Ghost. But He was more: He was her instructor

* Acts xiii. 2. † *Ib.* xvi. 6. ‡ *Ib.* xv. 28.

her teacher, and her guide; so also is the Holy Ghost, whom He sent, after His ascension, to occupy His place on earth, in the Church He had established.

It may be, however, remarked, that He no longer governs the Church personally, His voice is no longer heard, and He does not take, as it were, any active part in the government and administration of the Church. But visible or audible manifestations are not essential as proofs of His personal Presence. We each of us know we have a Soul, a substance separate and distinct from the Body it inhabits; we have never seen it, or heard it speak; our acquaintance with our own Soul is the innate consciousness that it is within us, and our knowledge of its existence is by its manifestation through the mind and the intellect, and the organism of the body. The real existence, then, within us, is not dependent upon any visible or audible manifestations. So also in the Church. The Holy Ghost dwells within the Church as a Divine Person.

It is true that at first He manifested Himself by descending, as it were, visibly under the form of "cloven tongues like as of fire," and by giving directions to the Apostles audibly, and by guiding them by means of a strong and overpowering impulse. But this was to assure the infant Church of His real and true Presence, in very Person, so that we might perceive that the fulfilment of the Lord's promise had been really accomplished; and having once come in very Person, He could not depart, because of the engagement Christ—so to

speak—entered into as the condition of His departure, that He would send the Holy Ghost in His place, who would "abide" with the Church "for ever," so that, having once come as a Divine Person, and as the Substitute of the Lord, He would ever continue, personally governing and administering the Church in which He dwells.

The Presence of the Holy Ghost is now ordinarily known by His manifestations through the Body of Christ. He speaks through her constituted authorities, *i. e.* the Pope and the bishops; and He directs the Church by those appliances which God has provided, and He governs her by means of those customs and laws which He has caused to prevail. He promulgates decrees, too, by Councils, which are drawn up in His own name—the Holy Ghost. His actual Presence is also discerned by the condition of the Church or community He is said to reside in; where He is present, there is necessarily unity and concord in all matters appertaining to the doctrine of faith and morals; where disunion and discord prevail, we may be quite certain that He cannot be in that community. But one thing is certain, that the Church into which He descended,—and became as it were incarnate,—must have retained all the characteristics which were the result of His coming; and further, that having come, He must be in the Church at this present time; and therefore it may be safely concluded that the true Church must be even now remarkable for its unity, its interior peace, and its restless earnestness in the performance of its functions.

Let us now examine carefully the mission the Holy Ghost was sent to execute. He was (1) to "abide" or dwell in the Church "for ever." During the whole Christian Dispensation He was to dwell personally with the Church of Christ. (2) He "shall teach you all things," *i. e.* He shall be the Teacher of the Church, instructing her in everything she ought to know. (3) He "shall guide you into all Truth"; the whole doctrine of Christ shall be brought to the mind of the Church. (4) He "shall bring all things to your remembrance whatsoever I have said," *i. e.* every truth which Christ had revealed to the Apostles, in the secret chamber, and after His resurrection, during those forty days before the Ascension, shall be brought to the recollection of the Church. (5) He shall also "show unto you," what "He shall receive of Mine"; that is, He will inform the Church of the whole mystery of the Incarnation and the Atonement of our Lord. (6) He "shall show you things to come," that is, He will prophesy in the Church, by those whom He shall from time to time move so to do. And (7) He "shall glorify Me," that is, He shall so inspire the Church, that she shall glorify Him by her witness of Him, by her devotion to Him, and by her works.

The Holy Ghost is therefore to the Church what Christ was when on earth, her Paraclete, *i. e.* her Teacher, her Guide, her Remembrancer, and her Inspirer. He was to fulfil this great mission, not for a time merely, not by the Apostles only, but "for ever," *i. e.* until the close of the Age or Dispensation. It is impossible to doubt that the

Church which possesses the Holy Ghost as her Teacher, her Guide, her Counsellor, her Remembrancer, and her Inspirer, must be infallible in her teaching, in respect both to doctrine and morality, and also in all her decrees when pronounced in accordance with those ecclesiastical principles which have always been in force. It is impossible that the Church can be fallible in the performance of its functions, if the Holy Ghost be really and truly present in the manner and for the purpose our Lord intimated to His afflicted Apostles. It is impossible that the Holy Ghost is not in her, dwelling in and with her, as her personal Teacher and Guide; because if it were not so the words of Christ would be falsified and His promises would be of none effect. It follows, then, that the Holy Ghost is in the Church at this moment personally; and therefore the Church is not only indivisibly one, and incorruptibly indefectible, but she is absolutely infallible in the performance of every function she has been commanded by God to perform for the promotion of His glory and the benefit of mankind.

Most of the passages from the Fathers which prove the doctrine of the infallibility of the Catholic Church have already been given, especially under the section "Indefectibility." I must therefore request you to reperuse those extracts, and when you have done so I think you will perceive that all of them, without exception, assume the doctrine, and employ language which can convey to the mind no other notion than that the Church is infallible. In point of fact, when the Fathers

maintain the indivisibility and indefectibility of the Catholic Church, so that she can neither be divided by heresiarchs and schismatics, nor be overcome directly or indirectly by heresies and errors, she must necessarily be infallible in her dogmatic teaching, and likewise when determining in the midst of disputations, what the clergy are to teach and people to receive and accept.

The following points in the passages already quoted, are to the purpose: S. Ignatius says that the Lord "breathed incorruption upon the Church," that is, He infused in her a divine life, endowing her with the fulness of the Holy Ghost, who was to abide with her, as the Paraclete, for ever. By this indwelling she is preserved ever pure and incorrupt, that is, immaculate as respects orthodoxy of teaching and in manner of life. Being therefore perfectly endowed with the Holy Ghost, and the divine influence within her being absolute, she is so energized by Him, that she ever hears His voice, and at all times accepts His judgment and follows His directions. Hence she says, at every general council, "It seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to us" * to do so and so, putting herself on a level as it were with the Holy Ghost, in the matter of authority; and why not? for has not Christ admitted the Apostolate, the Episcopate, and the whole Church on terms of equality, so to speak, when He said, "That they all may be one; as Thou Father art in Me, and I in Thee, that they also may be one in Us . . . . I in them [*i.e.* the

* Acts xv. 28.

Apostles, their successors, and the faithful], and Thou in Me."* The Church then being one with God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost, even as the Son is one with the Father,

* S. John xvii. 21–23. There are several other passages, which show this perfect threefold unity between God and His Church. It is a sort of Trinity in Unity, consisting of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, as personating the Church, which is thus verified by Him. "I appoint unto you a Kingdom, as My Father hath appointed unto Me."—S. Luke xxii. 29. "As my Father hath sent Me, even so send I you."—S. John xx. 21. Here we perceive these three points: (1) the Father, from whom are all things; (2) the Son, who receives from the Father, and is sent by Him; and (3) the Kingdom, which the Father gave to the Son, and which the Son delivered to the Apostles, whom also He sent into all the world to preach the Gospel. But these three are one, for Christ prays "that they all may be one; as Thou Father art in Me, and I in Thee, that they also may be one in Us . . . and the glory which Thou gavest Me, I have given them; that they may be one, even as We are one; I in them and Thou in Me, that they may be perfect in one. . . ."—*Ib.* xvii. 21–23. And so identical is this unity, that he who hears or despises the Church hears or despises Christ, and also the Father. "He that receiveth you, receiveth Me, and he that receiveth Me receiveth Him that sent Me."—S. Matt. x. 40. "He that heareth you heareth Me; and he that despises you despiseth Me; and he that despiseth Me despiseth Him that sent Me."—S. Luke x. 16.

The union of the Church with the Holy Trinity is as complete as possible, in a sense, of the same substance, inasmuch as her divine Head is not only consubstantial with the Father as God, but as Man, is also consubstantial with ourselves, we being declared to be "members of His Body, of His Flesh, and of His Bones."—Ephes. v. 30. The Church so united with the Blessed Trinity cannot be otherwise than infallible in her teaching, because she thinks as God thinks, wills as God wills, teaches as the Holy Ghost directs, according to that divine law of unity, which I shall discuss further on.

partakes of the fulness of that incorruption, which Christ breathed upon her in the evening of His resurrection day.

This S. Irenæus emphatically points out when he writes, "This office of God has been entrusted to the Church, as though for the breathing of life into His handiwork, unto the end that all the members partake (of this office) may be vivified: in this (office) too is disposed the communication of Christ, that is the Holy Spirit, the pledge of incorruption, the ladder whereby to ascend unto God." The gift of the Holy Ghost is "the pledge of incorruption"; that is to say, that as long as the Holy Ghost remains within the Church as her Paraclete—her advocate, her adviser, and her assistant—she must always be incorrupt, ever holding, teaching, and enforcing that which is true and orthodox; and when doubts arise on any point touching faith and morals, infallibly determine the same. And this so long as He remains within the Church, that is "*for ever*," even until the consummation; for, as we have seen, the Paraclete was promised to the Church to "abide in her for ever," and this perpetuity was guaranteed by the Lord when He added, "lo I am with you all days till the consummation of the world." The Church is ever at all times infallible in her teaching and in the promulgation of her dogmas. Hence S. Irenæus further adds, "Where the Church is, there is the Spirit of God; and where the Spirit of God is, there is the Church and every grace."

S. Clement of Alexandria teaches the same when he asserted that the Catholic Church, "which is

a City on earth," was "impregnable, and free from all oppression," representing "the divine will on earth as in heaven,"—that is, that error and heresy cannot overcome the Church; and if so, then the Church can never fail to teach what is true, and consequently in every age, she will represent, or rather she will execute the will of Christ, on the earth, even as it is always done in the court of heaven:—for, as he observes, "no gift of God is powerless; it endures, being incapable of being put down." The gift of God to the Church is the gift of the Holy Ghost, who abides ever within her, guiding her into all truth, being a mind to her mind, head to her head, heart to her heart, mouth to her mouth; so that the Church shall ever formulate dogmatic doctrine, and proclaim the same in all charity, and that, too, free from all error; for such is the office of the Paraclete.

Origen enunciates the same truth in another form. He declared that the Church is "the Edifice of Christ"; that He founded it upon "the Rock"; that both the Foundation and the Building are both together the Rock,—not two distinct Rocks, as some seem to hold, when they, misquoting S. Augustine, assert that each Apostle was a separate Rock; but one Rock, without seam, without division; one solid, compact, and indivisible mass, consisting of two things, *viz.* the "Foundation" and the "Edifice." Origen, quoting Scripture, says, "the gates of hell shall not prevail against it"; and to enforce this elementary truth, he quotes and requotes the same again, and paraphrases it thus: "The Church as the Edifice of Christ, 'who' wisely 'built His

House upon the Rock,' is not susceptible 'of the gates of hell,' for the 'gates of hell' are many and almost countless, not one of them shall prevail against 'the Rock,' or against 'the Church,' which Christ built on it." Here we see the doctrine of infallibility declared in respect to two things; (1) the Foundation, *i. e.* Peter; (2) the "Church"—not any church, whether episcopal or otherwise, but that Church, and that Church alone, which is built on the said Rock or Foundation, against which "not one of the gates of hell," that is, the powers of hell,—heresies, errors, and wickedness of all sorts,—shall ever prevail, for as Origen well puts it, "the gates of hell, which, prevailing against every one who is out of the Rock and the Church, have no power against her." If this then be so, the Church must ever be infallible in the performance of those functions she was commissioned to effect.

There is a remarkable passage in Tertullian's work on heresies. It seems that even in his time, as well as in this non-believing age, there were persons who had the temerity to charge the whole Church with error, and to accuse her even of teaching untruth. The Church of England has, as you know, fallen into this delusion, when it affirmed that the whole Church was idolatrous for many centuries. Tertullian pointedly meets this blasphemous error, and in so doing affirms the infallibility of the Church. He says, "Well then: be it that all have erred; that the Apostle also was deceived in the testimony which he gave; that the Holy Spirit had regard to no one of them, so as to 'guide' it 'into all truth,' although for this pur-

pose sent by Christ, for this asked of the Father, that He might be the Teacher of Truth; that He, the Steward of God, the Representative of Christ, neglected His office, suffering the Churches the while to understand differently that which He Himself preached by the Apostles,—is it likely that so many Churches and so great, should have gone astray into one faith? Never is there one result among many chances; the error in the doctrine of Churches must needs have varied. But what is found [one and the same] amongst many, is not error but Tradition. Let any one then dare to say that they were in error who delivered it." *

Can you or any one else deny that this extract is a clear and explicit affirmation of the doctrine of the infallibility of the Catholic Church? The heretics supposed that the whole Church had fallen into error,—that which had hitherto been taught was contrary to the doctrine of Christ. How does Tertullian meet this supposition? He points to the promise of the Paraclete, even the Holy Ghost, the Teacher of the Truth, whose one definite function is to "guide into all Truth" the Church of God. "Is it likely," he says, "that so many Churches, and so great, should have gone astray into one Faith?" that is, as I take it here, ironically, into an erroneous faith; for he adds, "Never is there one result among many chances."

The "Marcionites and the Valentinians" in his time, and I might add the Montanists (of which unfortunately Tertullian was soon to become a dis-

* De Præscript. Hæret., n. 28.

tinguished disciple and promoter), the Novatians and others in that of S. Cyprian; the Arians, Nestorians, Eutychians, &c. &c., have all and each put forth their several views of religion; but can it be said there is "one result," *i.e.* one form of dogmatic teaching? Certainly not, for the results are multiform and various, and contradictory to each other, —"never," says this great Father, "is there one result among many chances." "But what is found [one and the same] amongst many is not error, but Tradition. Let any one then dare to say that they were in error who delivered it." Why not? Because the Holy Ghost "was sent by Christ" for this very "purpose," that He might, as the "Steward of God and the Representative of Christ," "guide" the Church "into Truth," to cause the "suffering Churches" to understand the "one Truth," even that which "He Himself preached by the Apostles," and which He has laid up in that "beautiful vessel," as S. Irenæus describes it, *viz.* the Divine Tradition; which He, as the Paraclete, the Guide, the Teacher, the Assistant, guards and preserves in immaculate purity, by means of that Church Catholic, within which He for ever presides and governs. "Let any one dare to say that they" the Apostles by whom He preached, "were in error who delivered it"; let me add, let any one dare to assert, that the Holy Ghost, the Paraclete, who delivered this holy Tradition, has ceased to guard and preserve it, has permitted the legitimate successors of the Apostles to corrupt it, and the whole Church to fall into deadly heresy. He who was sent to be the Paraclete, the Guide, and

Teacher, and who was to remain as the indwelling Spirit within the Church, for ever, even until the consummation, could not, by virtue of His Divinity, of His Mission from the Father and the Son, of His office of Paraclete, and by virtue of the promise and guarantee of Christ, permit the Catholic Church to fall from the Truth, even for a single day. His very Presence within the Church is a proof of the Church's infallibility, and this is what Tertullian means in the passage I have quoted.

S. Cyprian follows, in perfect accord with his predecessors, in enunciating the divine infallibility of the Church. This Father asserts (1) That the "'Spouse of Christ,' which is the Church, is a 'garden enclosed,'—a thing closed cannot be open to aliens and the profane.'" (2) That the "Church is not 'without' [or outside herself], nor can be separated, nor divided against herself." (3) That "she preserves the unity of an inseparable and undivided House." (4) That "she cannot become adulterous." (5) That she is undefiled and chaste, owning "one home," and "guarding with spotless purity the sanctity [*i. e.* the inviolability] of one chamber." (6) That the "Church which believes in Christ, and which once holds what she has known, never departs from Him at all"; and this he repeats in another of his epistles,—"the Church departs not from Christ, notwithstanding the rising up of heresies." Here we see the infallibility of the Church proclaimed in definite terms, that is to say, that the tropes employed by S. Cyprian and the terms of expression are such, that the Church could not be otherwise than infallible.

"A garden enclosed" is a perfect trope. A space enclosed is one which is exclusive, the surrounding walls being an effectual barrier against all who are without. No aliens or heretics can by any legitimate means enter the "garden enclosed," for the walls prevent them. True, they may climb over the walls, in which case they are, as Christ says, "robbers"; and who would assert that a robber, having effected an entrance through the window of a house, becomes by that means a member of the family he attacks? He remains an alien all the same, and has no part or lot in the proprietorship of the house. The Spouse of Christ then is guarded by a wall, *i.e.* by the invincible ranks of angels, who, like the celestial guards of old, with their glittering swords "turn every way" to protect the sacred Tree of Life.

The Church, says S. Cyprian, is not "without"; that is, not outside the "garden enclosed," but within; and hence, she cannot be divided or separated against herself, for she "preserves the unity of an inseparable and undivided house." Therefore no alien can divide her, no heresy take possession of her, for she ever holds and teaches the Truth of God. For S. Cyprian declares she cannot be unfaithful to her Lord, she cannot be guilty of adultery, but is always "undefiled and chaste," she always "guards with spotless purity the sacred inviolability of one chamber." What is meant by spiritual adultery? Who are spiritual adulterers? This crime consists (1) of listening to other loves besides her one husband, the Lord; (2) of wilfully diverging in the slightest degree

from the standard of that Truth, even from that Deposit which Christ entrusted to her safe keeping; (3) of harbouring within her domain aliens, heretics, schismatics, and profane and wicked persons; for all these are adulterous, unfaithful men, who have forsaken Christ for other masters.

But this guilt we are told the Church cannot by any possibility commit, for she cannot entertain a thought contrary to the will of Christ; she cannot diverge a single point from that which He has determined, nor can she receive a false impression of any truth, much less promulgate it in the form of dogma. If so, then she is infallible, being incorrupt and incorruptible, being always undefiled and undefilable, and at all times chaste, "guarding with spotless purity the sanctity of one chamber." You observe how exactly accordant this great Saint and Martyr is with S. Ignatius, S. Irenæus, Tertullian, and Origen, on the great question under discussion, *viz.* that the Church Catholic, the Church of God, the Spouse of Christ, is infallible on every point which concerns the functions she was commissioned to perform.

There is a passage in Lactantius which witnesses in favour of the doctrine of Infallibility—he says, "From all this it is manifest, that all the prophets foretold of Christ that the time would come that, being born in the flesh of the family of David, He would build up to God an everlasting temple, called the Church, and would summon all nations to the true religion of God. This is the faithful House, this the immortal Temple, wherein if a man sacrifice not, he shall not have the reward of immor-

tality; of which great and everlasting Temple, since Christ was the Builder, the same must needs have therein an everlasting Priesthood."* The Catholic Church, then, was intended to be an "everlasting Temple," instead of the one local and temporary one in Judea; and its area was to be so extensive as to contain all the nations of the earth. It was to possess also an "everlasting Priesthood" in the place of the Aaronic, which was soon to pass away for ever.

In this Temple, and in this Temple alone, every man was to offer his sacrifice to God, and he who declined so to do would "not have the reward of immortality." Now this Temple was (1) founded and built by Jesus Christ, who, though God, was pleased to be born of "the flesh of the family of David"; (2) it was to be "everlasting," that is, it was never to cease to exist whole and entire; (3) it was endowed with the gift of immortality, that is, it ever lives a life of perfection. In a word, the Temple was founded and erected by Christ an indefectible and infallible Church, wherein all who desire salvation must sacrifice, or else forfeit the reward of immortality. And remember that this "everlasting Temple" is situated *on earth;* it was founded on earth by Him as Man of the "flesh of David," in which sacrifices are offered under earthly forms or symbols, by an "everlasting Priesthood" composed of men set apart for the purpose.

S. Alexander of Alexandria maintains that the Church cannot be "overthrown," but is "trium-

* Divin. Instit., l. iv. c. xiv. See Galland., t. iv. p. 295.

phant over every unhallowed revolt of the heterodox"; that is, she is infallible, ever teaching aright, and infallibly pointing out that which is true and that which is erroneous. Eusebius asserts that the Church is "immovable," being "firmly established and imbedded on a 'Rock' that cannot be moved nor broken," and "this because of that one word which He [Christ] uttered, saying, 'I will build My Church upon a Rock, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.'" And in another passage Eusebius says: "He, therefore, that promised to 'build' His 'Church upon a Rock' so as the gates of hell shall not prevail against her, He will be her guard and protector, fencing her round and protecting her, in order that the gates of hell may not prevail against her."* A Church which is "invincible," "immovable," against which the gates of hell cannot prevail, having Christ for her "guard and protector," must necessarily be infallible in the exercise of her heaven-appointed functions.

S. Zeno speaks of the Church in her character as "the Spouse of Christ," whom he describes as "chaste," and "honoured with the yoke of a celestial marriage"; showing that the Church is united with Christ and is one flesh with Him; and by way of attesting her infallibility, he declares she is a Virgin, and "continues for ever a Virgin." S. Ambrose dilates on the troubles that afflict the Catholic Church, and he says that, notwithstanding the attacks of her enemies and the disputations of the heterodox, "she looks on, herself

* Comm. in Ps. XC. p. 594.

free and exempt from all danger, whilst others are shipwrecked"; for, as he says in another work, "where Peter is, there is the Church; and where the Church is, there death is not, but life eternal." And therefore did he add, and "the gates of hell shall not prevail against it." And again, "My Rock is Faith; the Foundation of the Church is Faith. If thou be a rock, thou wilt be in the Church, because the Church is upon a Rock. If thou be in the Church, 'the gates of hell shall not prevail against thee.'" The gates of hell are the gates of death, but the gates of death cannot be the gates of the Church. Here we see the doctrine of infallibility in an extended sense. The Church is infallible because she is ever "free and exempt from dangers" of all sorts. She sees with sorrow the shipwreck of faith of multitudes of people—but she suffers no shipwreck, because she herself is always illuminated by Christ. And why is this? It is because the "gates of hell" have no power to overcome the Church, for in the Church "is not death, but life eternal."

But S. Ambrose unites this infallibility to the Church of S. Peter, saying, "where Peter is, there is the Church; and where the Church is, there death is not, but life eternal." So also as regards persons. Every Catholic is infallible, in that he is a rock united to the one Rock, on which the Church is founded, against which the gates of hell, that is, the gates of death, cannot prevail. But of course this infallibility of persons simply means the acceptance of the decrees of the Catholic Church, *i. e.* the Church of Peter, for "where Peter is,

there is the Church"; and again, *vice versâ*, "they who hold not Peter's Chair have not Peter's inheritance." This part of the subject I postpone for the present. The Catholic Church then, under all these considerations, it must be concluded, is infallible, in that she is exempt from all danger of being shipwrecked; for "death cannot be the gates of the Church."

S. Jerome likewise, quoting the words, "the gates of hell shall not prevail against" the Church, says, "I consider the gates of hell are vices and sins, or certainly the doctrine of heretics, by which they are enticed and led to hell"; but the Church nevertheless remains, "unshaken by any tempest," nor "overthrown by any wind or hurricane"; wherefore the Church, in morals and doctrine, is both indefectible and infallible. S. Chrysostom, of all the Fathers, is most dogmatic on the subject under discussion. And he seems, I think, to concentrate all the testimonies, in this respect, of his predecessors, and to give point to their statements, developing their arguments and bringing them out in bold relief. You must recollect that all the Fathers assume the doctrine of infallibility; it is impossible to read all the extracts I have quoted in this work without perceiving this fact. If this is not so, then it must be concluded that their language is mere verbiage destitute of any definite meaning.

S. Chrysostom comments largely upon the words "the gates of hell shall not prevail against" the Church. "Examine," says he, "the declaration as you please, and you will see its resplendent truth."

The gates of hell, he says, "are dangers that lead to hell." What are these dangers? They are, as he asserts in divers parts of his works, "tyrants" who persecute the Church, heretics who seek to corrupt her, and demons who lead men astray. Against all these the "Church is invincible, though assailed by so great conflicts," and "with invincible power effects all things with ease." She is indeed invincible against princes who persecute her, striving to force upon her the maxims of the world and the lax morality of the court, accompanying their efforts by violence often ending in death; and "yet all these snares and assaults were scattered more easily than a spider's web, dissolved more swiftly than smoke, and passed away more rapidly than dust." And S. Chrysostom then asks significantly, "Seest thou the force of the prophecy, 'and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it'?" And then adds, "From these have faith as regards the future, and then no one will prevail against it."

To every tyrant he says, "Nothing, O man, is more powerful than the Church. Give up thy conflict with her, if thou wouldst not have thy power destroyed; wage not war against Heaven .... it is impossible for thee to conquer, for God is stronger than all men .... God hath rooted [her] who attempts to shake [her]? .... The Church is stronger than heaven. 'Heaven and earth shall pass away, but My words shall not pass away.' What words? 'Thou art Peter, and upon this Rock I will build my Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.'" Invincible is she against all those tyrants, as regards force; infallible likewise in that

she cannot be deceived into the acceptation of error, nor be compelled by force to proclaim as dogma anything untrue.

Commenting on Isaiah ii., S. Chrysostom says, "See the accuracy of the prophet, who not only declares the fact (*i.e.* in the last days the mountain of the Lord shall be manifest) but also signifies the time .... He also designates the Church 'a mountain,' and her dogmas impregnable"; and thus he shows the futility of all attacks against a mountain, resulting only in the humiliation and utter exhaustion of the enemy. "Therefore did he [the prophet] call her a 'mountain' .... the firmness, the immovableness, the loftiness, the invincibleness of the Church did he indicate by that appellation 'mountain.'" "Her dogmas impregnable," as impregnable as a mountain, which cannot be attacked without exhausting its forces, and which physically cannot be overthrown. What are dogmas? They consist of doctrinal decrees on subjects of faith, and these S. Chrysostom holds are "impregnable," they cannot be overthrown; and why? because they spring from truth, because the Church which promulgates them is herself infallible, so infallible that she cannot issue a dogma or doctrine which is false or heretical; for if this were possible, her "dogmas" could not be impregnable. Hence her invincibility and impregnability in all matters concerning faith; she cannot err,—nay it is an absolute impossibility. As the mountain is an immovable substance, which all the armies of the world together could not even disturb or injure, so is the

Church—the mountain of the Lord in respect to dogma. But S. Chrysostom is still more explicit; he says, "withdraw not from the Church." Why? (1) Because "nothing is stronger than the Church"; (2) because she is our "safety," our "hope," our "refuge"; (3) because she never "grows old," "but her age is ever vigorous"; that is, she is omnipotent, and thus is she our salvation and our hope. Could this be if she were liable to err in faith or morals? Certainly not, for in that case she would cease to be strong; like Samson bereft of the hair of his head, she would become so weak and imbecile that she never could be our salvation or hope, and instead of leading us to heaven, she would certainly direct us to hell. But no, "she is stronger than heaven," and hence is she infallible in her teaching.

And this infallibility S. Chrysostom well puts forth when he asserts that Scripture demonstrates her "firmness" and "immovableness" under the symbol of a "mountain"; her "incorruptibility" under that of a "virgin"; her "magnificence," as represented under the figure of a "queen"; and her union with God, under the type of a "daughter." Under then the symbolical forms of a mountain, of a virgin—the type of perfect immaculate purity,—of a "queen," and a "daughter," S. Chrysostom teaches this great truth of infallibility, by showing the vast strength and power of the Church; her perfect, unalloyed, and immaculate purity, her magnificence and luminous splendour, and her intimate and substantial union with God, so real and so true, that

she is ever one with Him and He with her. How then can the Church be otherwise than infallible? Is it possible that if she be a mountain, a virgin, a queen, and a daughter of God, she can be fallible? No, it is impossible, for S. Chrysostom declares that "there is nothing equal to the Church," for "she is stronger than heaven"; — such is her mightiness, "warred against, she conquers; devised against, she overcomes; assailed with insult, she is made more resplendent; wounded, she sinks not; buffeted by the waves, she is not submerged; tempest-tossed, she is not shipwrecked; wrestling she is not overthrown; fighting as a pugilist, she is not beaten."

Why then, asks this Father, does God permit a contest so tremendous? That He may exhibit to the world His great universal Empire as one, indefectible, indivisible, and infallible, it being beyond the power of men and demons to divide or destroy her, or to lead her astray on any one point—no matter how subtle or perplexing—of faith or morals. Fair as the moon and resplendent as the sun, she shines on the earth as a great luminous beacon, attracting the gaze of all, captivating by her glorious beauty the weary-minded, and by her all-powerful influence drawing many to herself, enfolding them by her all-powerful arms, and enclosing them in that heart divine, which is ever faithful and true to God.

S. Augustine asserts that "the Church shall not be conquered," nor "be rooted out; nor give way before any trials whatever till the end of this world shall come"; for "she is the Holy Church, the one

Church, the true Church, the Catholic Church, which fights against all heresies and can never be defeated." She cannot be inspired by Satan or his evil spirits. All errors and heresies are the offspring of hell; but those "gates" cannot prevail against this "one" "holy" and "true Church," that is the "Catholic Church," because she is exempt from all danger of being led astray, for she cannot "be conquered" "nor rooted out," which she would be if this were possible; nor under such circumstances, could she maintain her character as the "true Church." No, it is impossible, and S. Augustine powerfully expresses this exemption from error, when he says, "nor [can she] give way before any trials whatever, till the end of the world." And Zacchæus expresses the same thing when he declares that that "mighty ponderous mass remains immovable in the midst of two assaulting waves, which break, tormented with their mutual violence." *

The Church, then, is an infallible communion, and this both Holy Scripture and the Fathers affirm in language clear and precise. It is true she does not use the word infallible, for in those days no one disputed her infallibility, except perhaps those who had been condemned by general councils as heretics; but the language they employed is equivalent in meaning. Holy Scripture declares (1) that the Paraclete, which is the Holy Ghost,

* Consult. Zacch. et Apollon., l. ii. c. xi.; Galland., t. ix. p. 231.

shall be sent to the Church and shall abide with her for ever, to guide her into all truth, and to remind her what Christ had said at the beginning, to be a witness to the world through and by the Church, "convincing" it of "sin," of "righteousness," and of "judgment"; in a word, to be the Teacher of the Church, and by her the Teacher of the world; and (2) that the "gates of hell shall not prevail against" the Church; that is, that no error or heresy shall obtain, even for an hour, possession of the Catholic Church, nor shall vices or sins ever overcome the Church; but, on the contrary, she will always turn them back to hell, whence they came, closing her portals against all who shall impiously entertain such abominable wickedness. These two declarations of Jesus Christ are the great guarantees He has given us that the Church shall never falter in her teaching, and shall never for an instant give heed to the evil opinions of heretics and schismatics. And these two guarantees Christ sealed by His prayer for the perpetual unity of His Church, and by His solemn declaration that "the gates of hell shall not prevail against it."

CHAPTER V.

RECAPITULATION.

From the above we perceive the characteristic mark that distinguishes the Empire-Church of Christ, by which it is known and identified, and shall be known and identified in every age of the world, till the consummation. And what is this distinguishing characteristic? It is Unity. And what is Unity? It is, as S. Paul says, "one Body." That as there is but one Lord, one Faith, one Baptism, so is there only one Body, *i.e.* the Church. This unity is both external and internal. External, in that the profession of faith everywhere is the same; the creed the same, the dogmas the same, and the regimen the same. Internal, in that all think alike on questions that are of faith, all speak the same things, and all united in one judgment. And this unity is indivisible, for it cannot be divided; indefectible, for no assaults from without and no treachery from within can corrupt it; age has no effect, for the Empire-Church never grows old, but is ever young and fresh as she was at the beginning. Kings and princes have done their best to destroy the faith, to cripple the hierarchy, and to impoverish its condition, but without avail, for it is always "invincible" and "impregnable." "The Church is stronger than heaven," said

S. Chrysostom; and if so, then if all the empires, kings, and potentates were combined against her, the Lord would laugh them to scorn, and break them in pieces like a potter's vessel. This unity, too, embraces the doctrine of infallibility, for a body which can never be divided, but is always indivisible, which can never be the subject of corruption, nor capable of overthrow, but always indefectible, must of necessity be infallible.

You will however say, I am begging the question, in asserting the infallibility of the Empire-Church as a necessity consequent from her unity, indivisibility, and indefectibility. The answer to this objection is, that if it were fallible it could not be indefectible; and if defectible, it could not be indivisible; and if divisible, it could not be one; and hence it would follow, that there was no such thing as unity. But Christ has guaranteed to the Church perfect unity. He promised her the gift of the Holy Ghost for five ends: (1) "to guide her into all truth"; (2) "to teach her all things"; (3) "to bring to her remembrance whatsoever He had said unto her at the beginning"; (4) "to show her things to come"; and (5) "to reprove [or rather "convince"] the world of sin, of righteousness, and of judgment." And the relationship of the Holy Ghost to the Church is that of the "Spirit of Truth," who was to come, not for a day, not for a generation, not for a century, but "for ever." "I will pray the Father, and He shall give you another Paraclete, that He may abide with you for ever, even the Spirit of Truth."

This unity Christ prayed His Church should

possess, even an unity similar in kind to that of the ever Blessed Trinity: so that the Empire-Church can never, even for a day or an hour, cease to be a perfect, indivisible, indefectible unity. And then, the solemn guarantee that "the gates of hell should never prevail against" this Empire-Church sealed the sacred promise of our Lord; and consequently, disunion, divisibility, defectibility, is an absolute impossibility in respect to this Empire-Church. Men may rebel, may become heretics and schismatics, and form themselves into large communities; but they affect not the unity of the Church: "they went out, for they were not of us"; they "rended themselves," but "they did not rend the Church." Wherever the unity exists in the doctrines of Faith, of Dogma, of Morals, and in essential Discipline, throughout the entire fold, there is the Church of the Living God, the "pillar and ground of the Truth." And that Church is for ever infallible, for she has within her the Spirit of Truth, guiding her into all truth, and bringing to her remembrance all that had been said by our Lord at the beginning. It is for you to consider candidly from the evidence adduced, whether the Empire-Church is not distinguished for her unity; and if she is, then you cannot deny that, together with that unity, there must be one-ness, indivisibility, indefectibility, and infallibility, for these points are the four essential elements that compose a perfect unity.

END OF VOLUME I.

WYMAN AND SONS, PRINTERS, GREAT QUEEN STREET, LONDON, W.C.

3572 260 L 35
Lindsay, Colin
AUTHOR
De Ecclesia et Cathedra
TITLE